HISTORY

OCTOBER, 1916.

THE GROWTH OF AN IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.[1]

In an address to his constituents some four months ago the Prime Minister respectfully commended to the consideration of his fellow-countrymen the problem of the future constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the Oversea Dominions of the Crown. The discussion of a mere problem of politics would not become an academic occasion like this, but there can be no impropriety in turning the attention of a university audience to the purely historical question, upon the answer to which must depend our efforts to solve and our success in solving the practical problem. To what extent have peoples been able consciously to mould their own institutions and to fashion their future? How far have those institutions been the outcome of unconscious or unwilling adaptation to an environment over which we have had a very imperfect control? "Human institutions," we have been told on what should be good authority,[2] "do not grow; they are made by human will for the realization of human purposes." On that faith in man as the conscious creator of his own political universe is based the confidence with which we are planning to build an Imperial Parliament after the war; and the bearing of that antithesis between growth and manufacture upon the past and future of our Parliamentary institutions is the subject of my discourse.

We need not, perhaps, delay over the terminological objection that institutions do not grow because they do not grow like a tree; and in dealing with human affairs we may assume the propriety of speaking of the growth of a Parliament in power and authority or of an individual in character, intellect, and grace, even though that growth is invisible to the eye and cannot

[1] The Creighton Lecture delivered before the University of London on October 19th, 1916.

[2] *The Times Lit. Suppl.*, May 25th, 1916, p. 242.

be measured in metres or described in terms of the three dimensions. Nor can we avoid the antithesis between human growth and manufacture by recourse to a theory of divine institution. An ex-President of the United States of America has, indeed, described the constitution of his country as "the greatest God has ever made"; but he was speaking with a conservative bias in the heat of a Presidential election, and if he had paused to reflect on the amendments which the American people have been constrained to make in this work of the Almighty, he might have been more cautious in claiming divine responsibility for the original. There is also a story of a hill tribe in India being discovered in the act of sacrificing to a deity which it called the Privy Council; but whatever faith we may have had in the divine right of kings, we are not, and we never have been, impressed with the divinity of Parliament. It is a very human institution, and it has either been consciously designed by succeeding generations of English statesmen, or it has grown through a prolonged and complex process of natural selection and adaptation to changing circumstance. The issue is one between human design and human evolution. If our forefathers consciously created, first an English, and then a British, Parliament to meet the needs of the people of these islands, we can hope by conscious effort to create a new Imperial Parliament to satisfy the wider claims of a British Empire. If, on the other hand, Parliament as it exists to-day was never designed or created by any conscious volition, then the argument in favour of the possibility of a new and special creation loses some of its force. That does not affect our appreciation of the need for a closer constitutional union between the realms of the British Crown. Upon that there is little difference of opinion, but it does affect our view of the methods and means whereby that end may be achieved.

Incidentally, the argument involves our whole conception of history and of the rise and decline of human societies. Institutions are the outcome of a people's growth, and they cannot be treated apart from the political, social, religious, intellectual, and economic development of nations. No pastoral community, and no community that was purely agricultural, ever possessed a Parliament; Parliaments have only been developed by peoples which have attained to an advanced stage of social and economic growth. Yet it is difficult to ascribe these indispensable social conditions to conscious human design or volition. Free will is a qualified attribute of the individual; it is a far more doubtful

factor in a people. An Imperial Parliament may be the outcome of this war; but the war was none of our making, and the British Empire might thus owe its unification to the German Emperor. That assuredly was not his intention; and it does not follow that because an institution has been the result of human action it is therefore the result of human design. Neither as an individual, nor as a society, nor as a race is man a free agent. No human slate was ever clean, and doubts of the competence of conscious human will to manufacture political organisms are inseparable from any sense of the profound influence of past inheritance and present environment upon the course of human action. The character, the intellect, and the will-power we possess as individuals are not the result of our own volition, and the person who thinks that our national heritage of Liberty and Empire is the simple product of national will cannot have thought to much purpose. Nor would that violent assumption carry us very far in our investigation; it would merely land us in another historical puzzle. Granted that our national will created our national Parliament, how did we come by that national will? We do not believe nowadays that Britain arose from the waves with Magna Carta in its bosom, and that the Englishman was endowed by a special dispensation with a natural thirst for a Parliamentary vote. Racially, the Englishman is something of a cross between the Teuton and the Celt, but neither of these races has shown in history any particular genius for Parliamentary institutions. We cannot account for the British Parliament by tracing it back to an aboriginal instinct.

Precluded from that explanation, we turned to a faith in a founder, and we ascribed our constitution to the beneficent foresight of an Alfred the Great, a Simon de Montfort, or an Edward I. Parliament became, in that view, the sum total of the constitutional achievements of a succession of Parliamentary statesmen; it was made, not by the national will, but by a line of supermen so superior to the common infirmities of that genus that they deliberately planned the supersession of the superman by the rule of law and the dominance of majorities. This theory represents the heroic age of historiography: it is easier for the adolescent mind to visualise a hero than a society, a creative act than a process of evolution; and pictures of Parliament-making belong to the cinematograph view of history. These brilliant achievements of heroes and statesmen fade into a soberer picture of growth, and we no longer believe that Alfred the Great founded our greatness, from universities down to the shire system

and trial by jury. We have learnt, for instance, that trial by jury was not Anglo-Saxon at all, that it took many centuries to grow, that in its original form of the inquest on oath it was not a popular institution designed to protect the liberty of the subject, but a royal expedient introduced from abroad in the interests of the Treasury. It was first imposed on England by William the Conqueror for the purposes of his Doomsday Survey, and it was about as popular as a more modern inquisition known as Form IV. So, too, Henry II. developed our judicial system, not for the sake of justice, but for the rewards or fines which justice brought into the royal exchequer. *Justitia magnum emolumentum.* If he could have seen into the future and known the uses to which his expedients would be put in later ages, he would have regarded the results as a monument of the irony of history and the perversity of fate.

What is true of our courts of law is also true of Parliament and the Crown. Where there has been design it has been changed almost beyond recognition by subsequent growth and use, and specific acts of creation have become wellnigh as obsolete in the science of history as in that of geology. None of the great elements in our Constitution were deliberately made. The sovereignty of Parliament is itself a growth; that is why it exists, for a sovereignty that is created is a contradiction in terms. The power that gives can also take away. No one made the Monarchy or endowed the Crown with the prerogatives it enjoys and jurisdiction it exerts. No one created the British Parliament or designed either the House of Lords or the House of Commons. No legislator drafted our common law or enacted the custom of the Constitution. No Act of Parliament or of the Crown established the Cabinet system or the office of Prime Minister. Responsible self-government is itself a matter of growth, and you may search the laws of the Empire in vain for a statute to the effect that any British realm shall be governed by Ministers responsible to an elected legislature. Here under the British Constitution we live and move and have our political being, just as we have our social being, not because any king or Parliament has conferred upon us liberty or empire, but because our constitution has emanated from the conflicting interests, ideals, and action of the community, operating through centuries of political intercourse and strife, and adapting its constitutional forms by tentative and experimental stages to the changing conditions of its existence. Other constitutions have been made and imposed by a conscious effort of will: ours does

not represent the design or volition of any sovereign, any statesman, any party, or any Parliament past or present. Monarchs and Ministers, Lords and Commons, Whigs and Tories, have all contributed to the result; but it is a fact, for which we may all be impartially grateful, that no party ever realised more than a fragment of its programme. We have fed in the course of our history on varied political fare, and our growth has been due to remarkable powers of assimilation; but the political physiology which shall teach us the principles of political digestion is still a sealed book. When it is opened it may be found to contain but few of the prescriptions of our constitutional practitioners. Nature is the first of humanity's doctors; men and women were born before there was medical science to usher them into the world, and human institutions grew before political science set out to teach us how to make them. I would not deny the value of political any more than that of medical science; but the physician does not ignore nature, and the student of human institutions must needs take account of the human nature in politics, and restrain his creative ambitions within the limits imposed by historical growth.

The history of our Parliament is the record of a development in which human design has played an almost insignificant part. Its founders, if it can be said to have had any founders at all, were unconscious of their foundations. If we had to select one individual to whom Parliamentary institutions owe more than to any other, it would not be Simon de Montfort or Edward I., but a monarch to whom both the name of Parliament and the idea of representative government were unknown; and our choice might fall on that Henry II. who, through his organisation of the royal system of justice, provided the means for the growth of English common law and encouraged all sorts and conditions of men to seek at Westminster a redress for grievances which they could not get remedied in their local or feudal courts. For we shall never understand our Parliament or our Constitution unless we grasp the fact that Parliament was primarily a court of law, and remains to this day the highest court in the British Empire. It is still called the High Court of Parliament, and we can trace substance behind the shadow of the name in the circumstances that the highest judge in the land also presides in Parliament; that the judges sitting as a Supreme Court of Appeal in the House of Lords are but a section of Parliament wielding a part of its authority; and that every Act of Parliament is, *ipso facto*, due process of law, which may be interpreted but cannot be chal-

lenged in any lower court. We sometimes complain of our lawyer-politicians; but the connection is inevitable, for politics are inchoate law, and law is crystallised politics. Parliament grew out of our common law; and if we are to have a common Parliament and common politics for our imperial community, we shall need for it a broader basis of common imperial law. It may be that, just as the judges of Henry II.'s *Curia Regis* worked out their law in practical administration, and then by their judicial circuits and assizes spread that practice throughout the kingdom and made it the common law of England, so the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council may hammer out a common law of the Empire and spread it by means of imperial circuits to the uttermost parts of the King's dominions.

In any case, it was the making of common law and the provision of a common resort for plaintiffs at Westminster that led to the growth of Parliament. In Parliaments, says the earliest description of them, which dates from the reign of Edward I., "judicial doubts are determined, new remedies are established for new wrongs, and justice is done to everyone according to his deserts"; and the necessary preliminary to a mediæval Parliament was a public proclamation in Westminster Hall inviting all who had grievances to be redressed to present their petitions by a certain date. For a century between the days of Henry II. and those of Edward I. this judicial machinery had been growing, and there are other facts which discount Edward's claim to be the founder of our Parliamentary system. There is no evidence that he ever dreamt of creating an elected legislative assembly. He was a great legislator; but his legislation was enacted in Council, and it does not appear that his so-called Model Parliament legislated at all. His services to the cause of Parliamentary development were for the most part undesigned. He did, indeed, like other monarchs of his time, summon elected representatives from the counties and boroughs to give the assent of their constituents to the taxes he proposed to levy. The difference between his expedient and those of his foreign contemporaries was that Edward I. amalgamated the elected tax-granting body of representatives with the High Court of Parliament; whereas in France, for instance, the Estates-General, or representative assembly, remained distinct from the *parlement* or court of law. When we remember that in England alone did mediæval representative government survive to modern times, it is hard to overestimate the importance of this English amalga-

mation of representative estates with the High Court of Parliament.

But it may have been accidental, and its importance depended upon the use that was made of the circumstance by later generations. The folk who came to Westminster at Edward's summons or invitation came to grant taxes or to seek judicial redress for their personal grievances. They did not come to legislate for the community, and their petitions were of a purely local or individual character; among the thousands that survive for Edward's reign there has not been found one for what we should call a general public act. Members were locally minded, with little national consciousness; and so long as their petitions reflected this characteristic, Parliament remained a court of law. For an individual grievance is a matter for judicial redress; a general grievance becomes a question of politics. The evolution of law into politics and of Parliament into a popular legislature was brought about by the transformation of the private petitions of individual members into the common petitions of Parliament. Summoned reluctantly to the court at Westminster to vote taxation, members began by degrees to compare the petitions for redress with which they had been entrusted by their respective constituencies; and they discovered that there was much in common between them, that king's Ministers and local magnates used and abused their authority in much the same way all over the kingdom. It then occurred to some unknown political genius, who almost deserves the title of founder of the House of Commons, that a speedier and more expeditious means of redress would be to pool their common grievances, embody them in a common petition, and back that petition with their united powers of taxation, instead of leaving each petitioner and each constituency to struggle as it might with the law's delays and the king's perversity. And so we find beginning, in the reign of Edward II., those common petitions which grew into the public Bills of the House of Commons, made it in time the predominant organ of legislation, and gave it still later control over the whole executive government. These are powers which grew with exercise, but were not made or conferred. Strictly speaking, the House of Commons to-day possesses no right of legislation; in form and in law its Bills are petitions, and the Crown alone enacts. The House possesses a *right* of petition and the *power* of making government impossible if those petitions are disregarded. Our point is that its powers were the outcome of growth, and not of design or manufacture.

The same is true of the composition of both the Houses of Parliament. No one designed either the House of Lords or the House of Commons; and both of them grew into what they are in spite of conscious efforts to make them something else. When Edward I. held a Parliament, the whole assembly met in a single chamber. The kernel of the assembly was the king's council in Parliament, consisting largely of judges, who sat on three or four woolsacks facing one another. Outside that charmed square, on the king's right sat the spiritual, and on his left the temporal peers, while various other "estates," lower clergy, knights, citizens, burgesses, stood or knelt at the bar opposite the throne. There in open Parliament—now concealed behind the modern name of the House of Lords—was transacted, as it is to-day, its solemn business, its formal opening, the reading of the king's speech, the trial of State offenders, the enactment of legislation, the proroguing of a session, or the dissolution of a Parliament. But after the declaration of the purposes for which they had been summoned, the various "estates"—the number three is a historical fiction so far as England is concerned—separated to discuss the king's demands and their own petitions in greater privacy. The lower clergy resorted to Convocation, and gradually ceased to attend the Parliaments at all; the knights of the shire and the town representatives continued for some time to deliberate apart from one another. That they should ever have coalesced is one of the astonishing features in English constitutional history. For the knights of the shire were lesser barons, and the lesser barons continued in other countries to form part of a single estate, the *noblesse*; while the third estate was restricted to townsfolk. In England, however, owing to causes which are partly obscure and wholly complex, the lesser barons failed to assert their nobility, made common cause with the townsfolk, and with them grew into the House of Commons. This amalgamation and the withdrawal from Parliament of the lesser clergy left the king's council and the spiritual and temporal peers alone to form what is called the House of Lords, though historically that House is the King's Great Council in Parliament, and to it are still summoned such councillors as the Attorney- and Solicitor-General, who never think of obeying their writs. It is the growth of custom, and not design or specific enactment, which has determined alike the form and the powers of Parliament.

Parliament, however, is supreme in our Constitution, because it embodies the Executive as well as the Legislature; and we turn for a moment to see whether the same preference of growth to

manufacture has marked the development of our administration. Once more we seek in vain for any deliberate act of creation : no statute established the Cabinet system, created the office of Prime Minister, or gave Ministers control over the House of Commons or the House of Commons control over them. The whole idea of connection between Legislature and Executive was anathema to public opinion in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries ; and if we had had to wait for specific creation, we should never have had responsible government at all. Ministers of the Crown were then regarded as prime agents of Parliamentary corruption ; and place-bill after place-bill was passed to preserve the purity of the Legislature from contact with the Court. No Parliament in the eighteenth century could ever have been persuaded to create a Cabinet system by statute : still less could it have been induced to make a Prime Minister. The term was almost one of abuse ; the Premiership was regarded as an obnoxious importation from France, and no accusation was more warmly repudiated by those who developed the office than the charge that they were seeking pre-eminence over their colleagues. George Grenville declared that Prime Minister was an odious title ; Lord North forbade its use in his household ; and a minority in the House of Lords, which on this occasion reflected public opinion, protested that "a sole, or even a First, Minister is an officer unknown to the law of Britain, inconsistent with the Constitution of this country, and destructive of liberty in any Government whatsoever." The English ideal was then Ministerial equality and that "separation of powers" to which Montesquieu attributed English liberty ; and any constitutional theorist or Convention would have rejected what have since become the corner-stones of our Constitution. We were saved then, as we may be again, by our history and by the difficulty of re-making according to plan a growth with its roots in the past. Every generation is wise in its own conceit ; but the collective wisdom of the ages proves greater than that of the wisest, and it is the climax of presumption when a generation thinks itself wise enough to bind its successors by fundamental laws and written constitutions and to lay upon the future the dead hand of the past.

That sublime confidence in the wisdom of their own generation inspired the labours of the fathers of the Constitution of the United States, which Americans have claimed as the greatest work of the Almighty and Englishmen have held up in these latter days for our imitation. But when we are told that our disputes about the interpretation of our own elastic and unwritten

Constitution warn us to learn from the wisdom of our revolted colonies, we may also remember that their written Constitution did not save them from the bloodiest civil war in history, and that, in spite of all amendments, the American Constitution still involves the American people in difficulties we should do well to avoid. Abraham Lincoln experienced some of them; in the midst of that civil war the term came round for a Presidential election. That term was irrevocably fixed by the Constitution, and there were no means by which it could be extended; unless there were a Presidential election in 1864 there would cease to be a President, and Lincoln, if he continued to exercise his functions, would become the merest usurper. And so, with one half of the nation fighting the other, the American people had to endure the added turmoil of a disputed Presidential election. Nor are the perils of obsolete prescription by any means exhausted. The Presidential election takes place in the first week of November, but the new President does not enter office until March. It is not impossible that President Wilson may be defeated; it is also not impossible that a renewal of Germany's submarine campaign may between November and March force upon the President the choice of peace or war; and the decision of that momentous question might have, by the written American Constitution, to be taken by a President in whom the American people had just passed a vote of no confidence. He could not escape the dilemma by resignation; and even if he committed suicide he would be succeeded, not by the successful candidate, but by the Vice-President nominated four years before by the discredited party. It may also be added that, strictly speaking, the election in November is not the election of a President at all; it is the election of a College of Electors, who in their turn elect the President. The design of the American Constitution was that this College of Electors should consist not merely of the elected, but of the elect of the American people, and that their sublimated wisdom should result in the calm and dispassionate choice of the fittest man for the post. Practice has perverted the elect into a body of ciphers with none but a numerical value: so vain it is by the best-laid scheme and the wisest design to prescribe wisdom for future ages.

There is one other provision in the American Constitution which so forcibly illustrates the point under discussion that it calls for a brief notice. The American Federal Constitution, and nearly all the written constitutions which the individual States enjoy, lay down the maxim that "no one shall

be deprived of his life, liberty, or property without due process of law." It sounds indisputable, and the design was excellent. But the American Constitution also makes the most rigid distinction and separation between the Legislature and the Judiciary. Congress is not a court: its acts are not, like Acts of the High Court of Parliament, "due process of law." Only the courts in America could deprive a man of life, liberty, or property; and they, of course, cannot legislate. Hence for more than a century, until the American Constitution was amended, the American people could not impose an income-tax on themselves, because an income-tax, imposed by the Legislature, deprived a man of property without due process of law. Similarly, the courts have declared invalid legislative acts prohibiting the use of the Stars and Stripes for commercial purposes, forbidding the payment of wages in kind, compelling mine-owners to provide washhouses, and so forth, on the ground that they deprived men of their natural liberty without due process of law. Strange, indeed, are the unrehearsed effects of constitutional design.

Even from our own Constitution, where we have avoided as far as possible attempts to manufacture fundamental law, we can illustrate the havoc which written law creates in conflict with historical growth. Far back in the reign of Edward I. the competence of the old county courts was limited to cases involving forty shillings or less. In those days forty shillings was equivalent perhaps to a hundred pounds in modern currency, and the county courts had a fairly extensive jurisdiction. But while the written law remained, the value of money fell, until in the eighteenth century a man, in order to recover any but the most trifling debt, had to bring a colossal and expensive action before the courts at Westminster, and the county courts dwindled from being the active centres of local government into the pettiest of institutions. Another illustration comes home more vividly to-day: in 1662 Parliament fixed the pay of a horse-soldier at 2s. and that of a foot-soldier at 1s. a day. The corresponding values at present would be something like 10s. and 5s.—the sum, we may note with interest, which it was found necessary to pay Colonial troops in the Boer War. Again, the written law remained while the real value fell, and with that fall declined the social status from which the British Army was recruited; instead of the British private soldier receiving the wages of a skilled artisan, he was reduced below the level of unskilled labour. It needs no elaboration to suggest the difficulties and the humiliations into which in modern times we have been led by this domination of the dead hand of a

written law. An Act of Parliament, and still more a fundamental constitution, the better adapted it is to one generation, the less it will suit another. Rigidity in human affairs and human institutions is the *rigor mortis*. That which is fixed is dead; it is only by growth and by change that we live.

There have, indeed, been occasions on which men have apparently succeeded in forestalling the process of growth and in consciously making a durable constitution; and the union between England and Scotland in 1707 and that between Great Britain and Ireland in 1800 have been taken as proving the ease with which two or more independent constitutions can be fused into a single organic whole. No one will dispute the immense value of the Anglo-Scottish union, at any rate; and to exclude human volition from all influence on the development of human institutions would reduce man to a blind automaton. But it is a legal rather than an historical view which regards that Union as the product of a single creative Act passed in 1707; and we must not ignore the conscious efforts that failed. Edward I. had tried to unite the two realms; Protector Somerset had seen a vision of a united "Great Britain having the sea for a wall, mutual love for a garrison, and God for defence, which in peace should not be ashamed nor in war afraid of any worldly or foreign power." James I. had attempted to convert the personal union of the two Crowns into a Parliamentary union of the two kingdoms; and Oliver Cromwell had brought it to pass at the point of the sword. But these conscious efforts impeded the natural growth of British union; and even in 1707 the union was incomplete. Scotland expressed its national voice through its kirk rather than through its Parliament, to which it was never greatly attached; and it refused to unite its kirk with that of England. It also clung to its legal system, and the union of the two Parliaments was followed by two rebellions. The real union between the two realms grew after the Act through the decline of theological animus, the unifying effects of the Industrial Revolution, of the common inheritance of dominions and oversea trade, and of the common development of responsible self-government which Scotland had never enjoyed before 1707. The Irish Union, indeed, was made and did not grow; but it would be a strange act of policy to hang round the necks of British realms another such union, and condemn them to another century of history such as that which elapsed between the rebellion of Robert Emmet and the rising of Sinn Fein.

But nowhere is the contrast between the growth and the

manufacture of institutions better illustrated than in the history of Britain's first self-governing Dominion. In 1837, when Queen Victoria ascended the throne, there were raging in Canada two rebellions, one under Mackenzie in British Ontario, and the other under Papineau in French Quebec, and after their failure Lord Durham was sent out to report on the whole situation. He made two principal recommendations:—(1) That the separate Legislatures for the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec should be united in a single Canadian Parliament; and (2) that this united province should be governed by Ministers responsible, not to Downing Street, but to the Canadian Parliament. The first of these changes was "made" by statute in 1840; it proved a failure, and in 1867 Upper and Lower Canada recovered their separate Legislatures. Durham's second change was not "made"; it was left to grow under the hands of successive Governors, and it proved a complete success in Canada and a model for the government of other British Colonies and Dominions. Throughout the British Empire, while specific Acts have been required to give Colonial Legislatures control of their own finances, the actual practice of responsible self-government has been a matter of growth and not of specific creation.

All this, it may be urged, is an argument against creation by a superior Imperial Parliament for the people of the Dominions; it does not apply to the creations of those peoples themselves. The deliberate federation of the six Australian States and the union of the four South African Colonies would, no doubt, have been failures had they been simply imposed by the British Parliament. But their success proves that separate States can federate or unite and make a constitution for themselves without waiting for the slow and haphazard process of growth. That is undoubtedly true, and if all the Dominions and Dependencies of the British Crown had grown so like one another in social development, economic needs, and political circumstance as the six Australian States or the four South African Colonies, and if they were equally anxious to amalgamate, the problem of Imperial Union or Federation would be comparatively simple. In each of those two precedents there was also contiguity of territory, and, what was more important, no great disproportion in size or population. It is easy enough to unite when union means equality; but men do not like predominant partners. That has been the real difficulty in the Irish Act of Union; union meant legislation by Britain for Ireland, and not a joint production. It was the rock on which earlier Anglo-Scottish projects of union

split. "What would you say," asked a Scot of an English statesman in discussing the proposal to marry Edward VI. to Mary, Queen of Scots, "if your lad were a lass, and our lass were a lad?" Husband and wife were, according to Roman and also to old English law, one person, and that person was the husband. England and Scotland would become one kingdom, and that kingdom would be English. States will sacrifice some of their individuality to a higher and common unity; they will not welcome absorption by a greater Power.

Apart from the enormous complexities involved with regard to India, Egypt, the West Indies, and the many Dependencies of the Crown, which enthusiasts would ignore by confining the scope of Imperial Union to the self-governing Dominions, the inherent difficulty consists in the facts that the total white population of all the other Dominions put together is less than a third of that of the United Kingdom, and that in any Imperial Council or Parliament, based on popular representation, the oversea members would be outvoted by three to one. This inconvenience meets with a somewhat drastic remedy in a suggestion I have seen from a Canadian source: it is there proposed that out of an Imperial Council of twenty-five members, two should come from Newfoundland, three from New Zealand, three from South Africa, four from Australia, five from Canada, and eight from Great Britain. Ireland, with sixteen times the population of Newfoundland and four times that of New Zealand, is ignored; each fortunate Newfoundlander is equated with forty-five inhabitants of Great Britain, and on an average each oversea Briton is to have the voting strength of five mere Englishmen or Scots. We need not be wedded to the principle of "one vote, one value" to feel some compunction about transferring the control of the British Navy and Army and the issues of peace and war to a council in which the representatives of the British Isles would be outvoted by more than two to one.

The control of the issues of peace and war is the kernel of the problem, and it carries us to the heart of its complexities. The Council or the Parliament that wages a war must control the supply of men, and our existing Government has found it necessary to apply conscription to Great Britain. New Zealand has followed suit, and Australia is next week to have a *referendum* on Mr. Hughes's Bill; but his proposal falls far short of the British measure. It does not include married men, nor only sons, nor bachelors under twenty-one, nor those who are supporting dependents; and so far there has been no

suggestion of conscription in South Africa, Canada, or Newfoundland. Such anomalies are tolerable in our anomalous Empire; they would be impossible under a single Imperial Parliament. We could not tolerate Dominion representatives imposing compulsion on us while exempting their own constituents; and, on the other hand, no one could contemplate with equanimity the prospect of an Imperial Legislature or an Imperial Executive attempting to enforce conscription on a Dominion whose representatives had voted against it, or trying to levy taxation which they had not granted. It is of the essence of our Empire as it exists, and of the national status claimed by the British realms, that they should be free to give or to refuse. They have given lavishly of their best; they would not have given if they had no choice. A free community can impose conscription on itself; it ceases to be a free community or to enjoy a national status when conscription or taxation can be imposed by others.

No doubt the case would be altered if we were convinced that the Dominions desired to merge their identity in a single Empire-community, and we need not assume the impossibility of such a communal growth. But it is not a growth that we can force, and it is well to fix our attention on the actual needs of the Empire and the demands of the Dominions. The specific demand brought out by the war is clear and simple enough, and it has been convincingly put by the spokesmen of various British realms. They find themselves and those they represent committed to a war in the making of which they had no voice; and they suggest with reason and justice that the perpetuation of such a condition of things might involve a slur upon their citizenship of the Empire and a strain upon their loyalty. But there is no desire, I take it, on the part of the Dominions to submit their domestic politics, their right of taxing themselves, of fixing their own economic and social, educational and ecclesiastical policy, to the arbitrament of a centralised Parliament in which they would all be outvoted. The question is purely one of foreign policy; towards the outside world the Empire wishes to stand as a unit; within its bounds its Dominions desire to manage their own affairs. That point can be met without recourse to a constitutional revolution or summoning a convention of the Empire to abolish all its Parliaments and construct a new one out of the *débris*. But it cannot be discussed without reference to another issue which agitates some of our minds—the question of the democratic control of foreign policy. If by imperial control of foreign policy and of the issues of war and peace we mean that diplomatic agreements are not to be

made nor military measures to be concerted with foreign Powers until those measures have been submitted to half a dozen Parliaments, and possibly to general elections or the referendum, that imperial control would seem a distant and impracticable project. Our foreign policy was hampered enough in August, 1914, by the necessity of consulting the House of Commons, and one could hardly regard with enthusiasm the prospect of submitting to half a dozen British electorates the future of Poland, of the Balkan Peninsula, or of the Turkish Empire, or the precise attitude we should adopt towards the varying views of our Allies upon those delicate problems.

We have, indeed, to be content with such indirect control of foreign policy as arises from the fact that it is determined by men who are responsible to the Parliament we elect; and there is no reason why the men who determine our foreign policy should not include representatives responsible to the Dominions. It required no constitutional revolution, and not even an Act of Parliament, to gather Imperial Conferences or to invite Sir Robert Borden and Mr. Hughes to attend at Cabinet meetings; and no Imperial Convention is needed to expand those spasmodic occasions into the custom of an Imperial constitution. Nor must we have an *auto-de-fé* of British Parliaments for the Crown to summon any number of Dominion statesmen by special writ to the House of Lords, and thus convert that ancient assembly once more into the King's Great and Imperial Council in Parliament. Without any Act of Parliament that House has been changed, for judicial purposes, from an unwieldy body of peers into an expert body of judges. The Crown can summon by special writ whomsoever it chooses; it has even of late reasserted its right of neglecting to summon those whose presence was not desired; and with a little courage and discretion the Upper House might be made a proper Chamber for the discussion and control of Imperial foreign policy.

The advantage would be that these steps could be taken experimentally and by degrees. There need be no constitutional burning of boats or leaps in the dark; an unsuccessful experiment need not be repeated; a successful expedient might be developed. It was by feeling their way that our forefathers led Great Britain along the path of constitutional progress and saved their country from the precipice of revolution.

So, too, we might thus recover something of that elasticity in our Constitution which the process of formulation has tended to destroy. Originally Parliament meant no more than a

"parley"; and Parliamentary government implied no more than government by discussion and consent. In course of time the conditions of the parleys and the persons to take part were more and more closely defined by custom, law, and statute, until Parliament has become a more or less rigid body, reacting with ponderous indecision to the ever-changing conditions of political and social life. Of late years the stereotyping of procedure in the House of Commons has driven really effective discussion, which influences votes and determines the fate of measures and men, into the lobbies and the smoking-room; and Bills have been remodelled in Committee not on account of what was said in the House, but as the result of parleys beyond its doors. Parliament has had to accommodate itself to these extensions of debate beyond its walls for domestic concerns, and it might well widen its parleys so as to comprehend Imperial deliberations. But the remedy for increasing rigidity is not the homœopathic dose of a written constitution; the spirit of liberty which informs the British Empire cannot be confined to the letter of a law, and the bond of blood and sympathy which unites its various realms will not be strengthened by conversion into parchment.

For half a century or more there has been a healthy reaction against the doctrine of *laissez faire*, and we are not in much danger to-day of falling into the heresy that the less a Government or a community does by corporate action, the better. We should rather beware of carrying that reaction to the other extreme of believing that our competence to create and remodel has left no scope for growth and for the play of forces which we cannot control, devise, or foresee. Men have lived and suffered and died in this war to little purpose if we have not learnt from our foes to shun the idolatry of the State and the dogma, on which that worship is based, that the earth and its fullness belong to man to make whatsoever he wills. Man has not made himself after a likeness he conceived; no Government planned the British Empire, and no Convention of peoples drafted its Constitution. It does not follow that things must needs go wrong unless we set them right; and we have not yet established a league for maintaining the law of gravitation or a society for promoting regularity in the rotation of the earth. Nor need we impale ourselves on the dilemma that, unless we make an Imperial constitution, our Empire will dissolve. It was not reft in twain in the eighteenth century because we let things drift, but because George III. and his Ministers, under the impetus of a great and successful war, which had exhibited and increased the strength of

the Empire, could not let well alone, but dreamed of reducing to form its heterogeneous substance. It is good to have our occasional visions from Pisgah, but even the mountain-tops of Scripture were not without their temptations; and if from one there was caught a glimpse of the Promised Land, from another there was unrolled a more seductive and delusive prospect.

To leave our Imperial future to growth and to cautious experiment is not to leave it to chance. There is no blinder historian than he who maintains that we blundered into Empire and became what we are through fortuitous circumstance. We need not presume that what we do not know is not knowledge; that effect has not followed from cause because we cannot trace the connection; that what we have not planned is pure accident. It is one of the wisest of our constitutional maxims that no Parliament can bind its successors; and the liberty we inherit is freedom from the mortmain of the past. I do not know by what title we claim to impose on posterity constitutional bonds which our forefathers have not imposed upon us, nor why we should think that a system, made to our measure, will compass the girth of the Empire to be. We see few signs of stagnation, and there never has been a political growth less suited by nature and circumstance for the deadly finality of a code than the British Empire with its infinite grades of development and variety of conditions. We might learn, moreover, from the Habsburg dominions to-day, if we have not learnt it from history, that we cannot fuse States into one by statute, convention, or conquest. Political unity, like personal happiness, comes not to those who seek it, though it may be met on the highway of duty or endeavour. Associations are not made for the sake of association; they grow out of a common desire to promote a common purpose. Union for the sake of union, Empire for the sake of Empire, the State for the sake of the State, art for the sake of art, life for the sake of life—all are conceptions bred of the same confusion of means with the end, of the path with the purpose. Essential unity has come in bountiful measure to British realms in this war, not because they sought that unity for itself, but because they found it in the pursuit of a common ideal, in the defence of common principles; formal unity may come in the course of time, but not because we strive to create it. It will grow as the outward sign of an inward grace achieved through a spirit of service and self-sacrifice for the commonwealth of nations and the common weal of man.

A. F. POLLARD

THE COLONISATION OF ULSTER.—II.

The policy of Plantation, the idea of "rooting out the natives from the soil," and garrisoning parts of Ireland with English settlers was not new. There are many plans for settlements in the State Papers, some tentative attempts had already been made in Ulster,[35] and the idea had been carried into practical effect in the Plantations of Leix and Offaly and in that of Munster. Much the same arguments were advanced for Irish colonisation as were supporting enterprise in the New World. First, it was to be a spoke in the wheel of Spanish Imperialism—"a defence," says Bacon, "against the foreign enemy . . . discomforting all hostile attempts of foreigners which the weakness of that kingdom hath heretofore invited."[36] Secondly, it was thought to be the safest and cheapest means of securing Irish loyalty, and introducing English "civilitie" and the English faith among the people. Thirdly, it was an economical means of satisfying the claims of English servitors and officials in Ireland, and an excellent opportunity of enrichment for the private undertaker. Fourthly, it was hoped that it would be a new source of revenue and strength to the Crown. Fifthly, colonisation was advocated as a means of relieving the economic distress in England, where the people "doe swarme in the land, as young bees in a hive in June." It would draw off the superfluous population and so act as a cure for English pauperism.[37]

Bacon, who was possibly the originator of the whole scheme for the colonisation of Ulster, had set forth all these arguments, and he was supported by the educated opinion of the day. Sir Thomas Blenerhassett, *e.g.*, drew the attention of adventurous Englishmen "to fair England on the one hand, who hath more people than she can well sustain," and, on the other, to goodly Ulster, whose "pleasant fields and rich grounds" lie desolate

[35] "Sixteenth-Century Attempts to Recover Ulster," *Ulst. Journ. Archæol.*, 1854.

[36] Bacon, in *Life and Letters* (ed. Spedding), IV., 116–26.

[37] Beer, *Origins of the Brit. Colonial System, 1578–1660.* Cf. *Economic Theory of Colonisation*, Ch. III.

for want of inhabitants.[38] "A barbarous country," wrote Davies, "must first be broken by a war, before it will be capable of good government," and when "it is fully subdued and conquered, if it be not well planted and governed . . . it will eftsoons return to its former barbarism."[39] The way for the Plantation was finally secured after the "Flight of the Earls" by the suppression of O'Dogherty's rising in 1608, the last flicker of rebellion in Ulster. As the claims of the Irish could not very well be absolutely ignored, it had first to be proved by English law that they had no right to their lands. Sir John Davies, the Attorney-General, who has left us the most lively account of these proceedings, took the matter in hand. The lesser tribesmen were shifted from one legal position to another as it suited the Government's interest. At first they had been tenants at will; then they were freeholders; then these were again designated as tenants at will, for if freeholders then their freeholds could not be destroyed through the treason of the chiefs. On the death of Shane O'Neill an Act of Parliament had vested most of Ulster in the Crown, and it was ultimately through this Act, the eleventh Elizabeth, that the six counties of Donegal, Tyrone, Armagh, Coleraine, Fermanagh, and Cavan were now confiscated.

The Plantation was carried through by a series of three Commissions. The first was appointed in 1608 to establish the general claim of the Crown, and shortly afterwards a "Project of Plantation"[40] was drawn up providing that the lands were to be divided between (a) English and Scottish Planters who might settle their proportions with English and Scottish tenants; (b) servitors of the Government who might take English or Irish tenants at their choice, the servitors as military men being better able to keep the Irish in hand; and (c) Irish, who were to be freeholders after English law. The proportions of land were to be of three different quantities, viz., 1,000, 1,500, and 2,000 acres. Every proportion was to be under a parish, on which a parish church was to be erected, and the incumbent, in addition to tithes, was to receive 60 acres in the 1,000 as glebe. The Planters, presumed to be "civil men well affected in religion," were to be nominated by the King, and lots were to be cast for the site where each was to be planted. The detailed "Orders and Conditions"[41] to be observed were then issued, a kind of

[38] Blenerhassett, *Direction for the Plantation of Ulster*, 1610. (Letter to Prince Henry.)

[39] Davies, *Discoverie*, p. 5.

[40] Harris, *Hibernica*, 1747, pp. 53–62.

[41] Harris, pp. 63–67.

Government prospectus to induce settlers to come forward. For every 1,000 acres, English and Scottish undertakers were to pay £5 6*s.* 8*d.* to the Crown. This rent was to be remitted for the first two years. Every undertaker of 2,000 acres was to build a castle with a strong court, or bawn, about it; every undertaker of 1,500 acres was to build a stone or brick house with a bawn; every holder of 1,000 acres, at least a bawn. For purposes of defence, all were to induce their tenants to build their houses near the castle or principal house, they were also to have in readiness a convenient store of arms. All were to take the Oath of Supremacy, and "to conform themselves in religion to his Majesty's laws." None were to alienate their portions to "meere Irish," but were to place a competent number of English and Scotch on their lands, on which they themselves were to reside in person for at least five years. Timber from his Majesty's woods was to be supplied free, and provisions, materials for building, and tools for husbandry might be imported from Great Britain free of duty. The undertakers might also export all their commodities for seven years free of custom. As for the servitors, they were to hold on practically the same conditions, but for the privilege of having Irish tenants they were to pay a higher rent. The Irish freeholders were to pay £10 13*s.* 4*d.* for every 1,000 acres, and were to build houses and bawns as the other undertakers and to "use tillage and husbandrie after the manner of the English Pale." They were not required to keep arms or to take the Oath of Supremacy. In every county a certain number of market towns, corporations, and free schools were to be built. As for the "unprofitable lands," as they were called, to each proportion was to be added, "such quantity of bog and wood as the country shall conveniently afford." These arrangements received the greatest consideration and care, not only from the Government, which was determined to avoid the mistakes made in former Plantations, but from King James himself, who looked upon Ireland as his special care, and was anxious to complete the unifying process in his three kingdoms.

The Lord Deputy, Sir Arthur Chichester, a remarkable man, who was more far-seeing than most of his contemporaries, prophesied future trouble, and pointed out the weak features of the scheme. Though, indeed, he had a low opinion of the native Irish, he thought that their interests should be placed in the foreground, and that the land should first be divided among the chief inhabitants, after which the colonists might occupy the superfluous districts, and educate the Irish to English civility by

gentle persuasion and the force of example.[42] He was overruled, however, by the greed of those who were now determined to advance their fortunes in Ireland, and who brought suitable pressure to bear.

A second Commission was appointed in the summer of 1609 to make an exact survey of the escheated counties, define the boundaries of the ballybetaghs, balliboes, tathes, tolls, and other Irish land measures, to distinguish between the temporal and Church lands, to mark out the new precincts and parishes and the sites of the towns. The Commissions held inquisitions in every county, and sent on Sir Josias Bodley and other surveyors in advance, accompanied by a guard, for, as Davies explains, "though the country was then quiet, and the heads of greatness gone, yet our geographers do not forget what entertainment the Irish of Tyrconnell gave to a map maker at the end of the late rebellion, for one Berkeley, being appointed to draw a true and perfect map of the north part of Ulster, when he came into Tyrconnell, the inhabitants took off his head because they would not have their country discovered."[43] The beautiful maps executed on this occasion, by which, says Davies, "the most obscure part of the King's dominion is near as well known as any part of England," show, by means of various colours, the boundaries and divisions of all the confiscated and unconfiscated lands, and are, of course, of inestimable value to the student of the Plantation.

A third Commission was appointed in 1610 to make the final arrangements; and Davies went north, accompanied by Chichester with an army, to persuade the natives that they had no right to their lands. They began with Cavan, where the inhabitants, bordering as they did upon the Pale, had learnt to think in terms of English law, and had hired a lawyer to advance their claims. Davies dismissed their arguments with contempt. They could not show, he said, the origin of their estates by English law nor had they any real estates of inheritance, and he also pointed out that as O'Reilly had forfeited his lands the King could now dispose of them as he thought fit; because he was bound, he said, to reduce his people from barbarism to "civilitie," and if themselves were suffered to possess the whole country as their septs had done for many hundreds of years past, they would never, to the end of the world, build houses, or improve the land as it ought to be; but the transplantation, he added, would be made by his Majesty rather like a father than

[42] *Cal. S.P.I.*, 1606–8, p. 276.

[43] Davies to Salisbury, August 28th, 1609; *Cal. S.P.I.*, 1602–10, p. 280.

a monarch, for they were to have competent portions of land assigned to them, many of them in the same barony as before. "Wherewith," says Davies, "the natives seemed not unsatisfied in reason, though they remained in their passions discontented, being much grieved to leave their possessions to strangers." [44]

The back of the difficulty was now broken, for, as Davies further explains, "the eyes of all the natives in Ulster were turned upon this county . . . because when they saw the difficulty of the business overcome here their minds were the better prepared to submit themselves to the course prescribed by his Majesty for the Plantation, and the service was afterwards performed in the rest of the counties with less contradictions." [45]

In order to secure the success of the enterprise, the Government approached the City of London with a view to planting the valuable and attractive county of Coleraine. The native Irish were here both warlike and numerous, and it was thought that co-operative enterprise was necessary to cope with any difficulties that might arise.[46] The district, too, contained the city of Derry, "the key to Ulster," since it commanded the approaches to the sea, and could also be made impregnable from the land. As schemes of American colonisation were then attracting business enterprise, a special effort had to be made to impress the burgesses with the advantage to be derived from an Irish settlement. A paper was drawn up and submitted to the Londoners,[47] in which the natural advantages of Ulster were described in glowing terms. James I. had just raised a forced loan in the City, and it is possible that he intended the Plantation as a means of repayment. The London companies at first seemed reluctant to move, but owing perhaps to the persuasions of Sir Thos. Phillips, who had lands in Coleraine, they deliberated on the subject, and coming to the conclusion that it might be a matter "tending to their present honour and future commodity," they despatched four agents to Ireland, to discover the prospects of what they viewed in the light of a big commercial speculation. The Government selected Sir Thos. Phillips to accompany them as an interested party, with instructions to lead them by the best ways. They were delighted with the country, and especially with the salmon fisheries of the Bann and the Foyle, and brought back samples of many natural products to show to their fellow-citizens. As

[44] Davies, *Historical Tracts*, pp. 281–4.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 285.
[46] Harris, *Letter of Sir Thos. Phillips*, pp. 129–135.
[47] "Motives and reasons to induce the City of London to undertake the Plantation in the North of Ireland" (*Concise View of the Irish Society*, pp. 5–8).

a result of this visit, on the 28th June, 1610, a definite agreement was drawn up with the Government,[48] by which the Corporation obtained excellent and distinctive terms. The City received the entire county, henceforth known as Londonderry, which was composed of Coleraine, part of Tyrone, and the adjoining districts in Donegal and Antrim. This was to be held of the Crown in common socage, and the rents and profits were to be equally divided amongst the twelve principal companies of the City; two hundred houses were to be built in Derry within a two-years' limit, and one hundred at Coleraine. The City was to have the ecclesiastical patronage of the two towns, the fisheries of the Foyle and the Bann, and the extensive woods of Glenconkene and Killitrough. There was to be freedom of import and export, and a monopoly in flax, hemp, and other commodities. A sum of £20,000 was to be levied by the City, whereof £15,000 was to be expended on the intended Plantation and £5,000 for the clearing of private men's interests in the things demanded. The King was so pleased with this agreement that he expressed his belief that when his enemies should hear "that the famous City of London had a footing therein, they would be terrified of looking into Ireland, the back-door to England and Scotland."[49] A company was then formed by the Londoners to manage the Plantation, known as "The Irish Society." Each of the twelve London companies received one-twelfth part of the lands, the Society reserving to itself the city of Derry and town of Coleraine, together with all the fisheries and ferries throughout the whole district, which could not be conveniently divided.

The Londoners, having more capital and better support than the other undertakers, got to work the quickest. The English and Scottish settlers came over in good numbers, but delays were caused by the difficulty of getting rid of the Irish. A large number of "swordsmen," or idle gentlemen, who constituted the most dangerous element in the population, were transported into Connaught or Munster, or were shipped abroad to serve in the Swedish wars. Those who remained had to remove to certain poor and barren lands, which were reserved for them within the six counties, or to the estates of servitors or bishops. Those who had land left to them were naturally discontented at its small extent, "the word of removing and transplanting," according to Chichester, "being as unwelcome as the sentence of

[48] "Acts of Agreement between the Lords of the Privy Council and the Committees appointed on 'behalf of the City of London'" (*Concise View*, pp. 9–13).

[49] Harris, *Letter of Sir Thos. Phillips*, p. 130.

death";[50] some, indeed, "would have scopes like counties, who had only a mantel and sword," and refused to accept their portions till the news of Tyrone's blindness finally ended all hope of his return.

The total number of acres confiscated in the six counties was about 3,798,000, of which only 503,458 are mentioned as being profitable or arable land. Two-fifths of the whole went to British undertakers, one-fifth to the Church, and one-fifth to the servitors and Irish between them. The latter were, of course, more numerous, and so their lots were very small. They received about one-eighth of the whole Plantation.[51]

The Plantation, as mapped out on paper, however, did not come into practical effect. The transplantation of the Irish was to be the chief feature of the scheme, but they were found so necessary to the settlers from the economic point of view that in many cases they retained them on their lands. "The Irish tenant," it was said, "is more servile than the British, he will give more custom (*i.e.*, butter, pigs, fowls, turf and manual labour), he is content with a shorter lease, and no expense is entailed in securing him."[52] In 1611 Sir George Carew, who made a survey of the Plantation, reported that a large number of Irish had remained on lands from which they ought to have departed, and from this he prophesied a rebellion.[53] In 1619 the same condition was so noticeable that Captain Pynnar was doubtful whether the colony would endure. In his survey[54] he enumerates nearly 2,000 British families in the six counties, and says that 126 castles had been built, and 42 isolated bawns; he notes, however, that there was a general want of buildings, and that the settlers were quite outnumbered by the Irish. Many English had not yet begun to cultivate their lands, and as they were afraid to bring over servants and cattle, they let out their grounds to Irish graziers at exorbitant rents. A feeling of insecurity had been bred by a partial rising of the Irish in 1615, but the lurking bands of wood-kerne or outlaws were a more continuous source of danger. Making sallies from the bogs and woods, they preyed upon the cattle of the settlers, one of whom complained, "they do threaten every hour, if opportunity of time and space doth serve, to burn and steal."[55] Pynnar gives full details of the pro-

[50] Chichester to Salisbury, July 19th, 1610, *Cal. S.P.I.*, 1608–10, p. 479.

[51] *Cf.* Bonn, *Die Englische Kolonization in Irland.* I., p. 335.

[52] "Discourse on the Settlement of the Natives in Ulster, 1628." *Carte MSS.*, Vol. XXX., pp. 3–8.

[53] Bagwell, *Ireland under the Stuarts*, I., p. 81.

[54] Harris, pp. 73–128.

[55] Blenerhassett, p. 5.

gress of the settlement. The castles, or fortified houses, were usually from sixty to eighty feet in length, two or three storeys high, and were generally surrounded by a bawn or rampart of lime and stone. These bawns were often seventy feet or so square and fifteen feet high, with flanking towers at the corners. Near them were generally a few houses, often described as being built of cage-work—*i.e.*, with strengthening-timber beams. The smaller gentry and clergy seem to have resided in long, low, thatched houses, with a ground floor, and some rooms in the slope of the roof. A good many of the estates of Pynnar's time had already changed hands, which had resulted in considerable sub-letting, and a consequent rise of rents. The Scottish undertakers, mainly from the Lowlands and Border Counties, had come, according to Chichester, "with more pomp," "but with less money in their purses" than the English,[56] and had made much better colonisers. They had made more out of their Irish tenants, and were more industrious in tilling the soil. As for the Londoners, they, having an eye to immediate profits, had of all the settlers paid the least attention to the Plantation rules. Out of 607 townlands settled by the Companies 305 were inhabited by Irish, who were found in 1628 to be maintaining twenty-four priests and eighteen chapels supported by an income of £1,000. Sir Thos. Phillips, who had been obliged to surrender some cherished property to the Londoners, complained of them in a letter to Charles I.[57] They kept the natives upon the land, he said, because they could reap more profit from them than from the British—"in all the escheated counties," he points out, "there are not above 6,000 British bodies, and most of them unarmed, and the natives who daily watch for the return of their young lords (as they term them), Tyrone and Tyrconnell, and the rest now in the Spanish Army, promising themselves a repossession of their county, are at least four times as many, so that the covetousness of the Londoners, meeting with the rebellious hopes of the Irish, has bred the danger which his precedent Majesty sought to avoid." The Londoners had also obtained more land than it was the King's intention to grant, had neglected to build houses and schools, had rack-rented, and sold as merchandise the timber that had been granted for Plantation purposes. Charles I., who was never on good terms with his democratic capital, struck it a side-blow in Ireland by annulling the patents granted to the county by James. A fresh charter

[56] Chichester to Salisbury, November, 1610, *Cal. S.P.I.*, 1608–10, p. 526.
[57] Harris, pp. 129–134.

was granted at the Restoration, however, under which the Irish Society and the Companies still hold.

The Plantation, it will be noticed, had only taken effect in six counties of Ulster. Antrim and Down had been receiving a more or less continuous stream of Scottish immigration since the fifteenth century,[58] but in 1605 James I., who confirmed the possessions of the MacDonnells in N. Antrim, made further grants to two Scotsmen, who brought over a large band of settlers from the Scottish Lowlands, a band which was to impress their character permanently on the country. Scotland at this time was a poor land which was beginning to be too small for a growing population, so that the Laird of Braidstone in Ayrshire, Sir Hugh Montgomerie, and his brother, "seeing that Ireland must be the stage to act upon, it being unsettled . . . concluded to push for fortunes in that kingdom."[59] Sir Hugh, who was kept informed of doings in N.E. Ulster through certain trading connections, found himself able to render a signal service to O'Neill of Clannaboy, who in return made him a grant of half of his lands. The King was induced to give his approval; and Montgomerie was granted the lands, while James Hamilton, who had formerly acted as a political agent for the King, under cover of "keeping a public Latin school in Dublin," gained the northern half of County Down with the title of Viscount Clannaboy, which descended to his heirs. He founded the towns of Bangor and Killyleagh, built many churches, and brought over a number of Scottish ministers.[60]

Sir Hugh began to plant in May, 1606, and was accompanied by various "substantial persons," farmers of good Ayrshire and Galloway names:—Cunninghams, Shaws, Muirs, Boyles, Harvies, Adairs, Montgomeries, Calderwoods, etc. As a result of the late wars they found the country "more wasted than America (when the Spaniards landed there)," for between Donaghadee and Newtown "thirty cabins could not be found, nor any stone walls, but ruined, roofless churches, and a few vaults at Gray Abbey, and a stump of an old castle at Newtown."[61] Sir Hugh's workmen, however, soon made cottages and booths for themselves, and the said stump of a castle fit to shelter the Laird and his family. Round the castle grew up the flourishing town of Newtownards. Farms and water-mills were

[58] On the "Scottish Migration to Ulster," *cf.* Ford, *The Scotch Irish in America*, 1915, pp. 92 *sqq.*

[59] *Montgomery MSS.* (ed. Hill), p. 19.

[60] *Hamilton MSS.*, ed. Hill.

[61] *Montgomery MSS.*, p. 58.

erected and linen and woollen manufactures were set up. Thus the people were "prevented the necessity of bringing meal from Scotland, and grinding with quairn stones" after the Irish manner,[62] and were soon able to wear their own homespun. The colonists built stone houses and established trading relations with the Continent. By 1610 Montgomerie was able to muster as many as 1,000 men in arms.[63] His brother, who had "great skill"—"in ecclesiastical matters and abilities for State affairs" —received from the King the three Bishoprics of Derry, Clogher, and Raphoe. His wife expressed a hope "that we shall not stay long in Ireland." She did not like the climate or the people, but had to admit that it was a fine country, and she was struck by the "fat beeves and fat sheep brought in by our tenants as fast as we can use them," and by the country flax and thread, of which she sent samples to her friends in England.[64]

Monaghan had also been excluded from the Plantation. On the execution of Hugh Roe MacMahon towards the end of Elizabeth's reign the land had been divided amongst the clansmen, who were converted into a sort of free tenantry, their former services being commuted into an annual rent. This was the county described by the Lords Justice in 1641 as the poorest and most uncivilised part of the kingdom,[65] which, together with the fact that many of the poorer Irish in the escheated counties still retained their pastoral habits and primitive methods of agriculture, shows the failure of English policy from the social point of view.

The Rising of 1641 was the first direct result of the land settlement. It was the price paid by the colonists for their short-sighted and selfish policy towards the Irish, and for their disregard of sufficient military precautions to ensure their own safety. The pioneer colony, however, survived the massacres, as it had survived religious persecution under Charles, and as it was to weather the Civil War. By this time it had become thoroughly Scottish in character, and was distinguished by the rapid growth of its characteristic institution—the Presbyterian Church. The colonists were constantly reinforced—by the Cromwellian and Williamite settlements, by Huguenot immigration, and as a result of the political unrest in Scotland consequent on the Jacobite risings. In time material success was assured and all vestige of the clans disappeared.

[62] *Montgomery MSS.*, p. 63.
[63] *Ibid.*, p. 66.
[64] *Trevelyan Papers*, pp. 93–100.
[65] *Cal. S.P.I.*, 1633–47, p. 278.

The Plantation in Ulster was the crowning achievement of English policy in Ireland after the Tudor Conquest, and as such it was regarded in England with pride and satisfaction. "Ireland," wrote Bacon, "is the last of the daughters of Europe which hath come in, and been reclaimed from desolation to population and plantation, and from savage and barbarous customs to humanity and civilitie." In the main, certainly, the chief object of the Plantation was afterwards achieved, in that Ulster preserved its homogeneous and exclusive character, and has been a bulwark against Irish nationalism. Looking at the matter from a modern standpoint, we can see that the suppression of Irish culture and the confiscation of the land were not only a gross injustice, but an error which has influenced adversely the subsequent course of Irish history. A wiser statesmanship would have sought to connect the interests of the Irish people with the system of law and order which it was proposed to introduce. The conversion of a tribal people into a feudal society bound by legal right was not, however, an easy matter. That there was no united and strong national party, but only a series of tribes, mainly with conflicting interests, and that within these tribes, owing to such customs as that of Tanistry, there was no means of establishing a governmental control; all that made it impossible for the Government to adopt any single or entirely consistent policy. Three possible methods of dealing with the problem suggest themselves: (1) Ireland might have been assimilated to England by more thorough-going methods, *i.e.*, the whole country might have been planted; (2) a nation might have been developed on Irish lines—*e.g.*, O'Neill could have been instituted as President of Ulster under the general suzerainty of the English Government; (3) a partial assimilation with England might have been carried out by allowing the Irish and English systems to exist side by side, and trusting to the growth of trade and private property to secure the predominance of English ideas. The last method would appear to have been the most hopeful of success. Before the Plantation the Irish of Ulster had traded with the Continent—O'Donnell, for instance, was widely known as the "King of Fish" by the exchange of his salmon for foreign wines. Many English had also settled in the North,[66] and we have evidence of the incoming of foreign capital—the enterprise, *e.g.*, of Dutch merchants being found as far inland as Fermanagh.[67] There was also the peaceful pene-

[66] *Cf.* Names of English jurors in Bodley's *Survey* (Hill, *Plantation of Ulster*).

[67] Davies to Salisbury, September 20th, 1609, *Cal. S.P.I.*, 1608–10, p. 288.

tration by Scotsmen of Antrim and Down. No land policy, however, was likely to have any marked success so long as there was a diversity of religious interest and sentiment between the two peoples. The method by which England introduced the Reformation into Ireland must always be condemned. Religious prejudice was rudely violated—the people were persecuted, and the Protestant Church so neglected her duties in educational and cognate matters that it justified the description of an English writer, "as that desolate vineyard of the Church of Ireland, which bringeth forth sour grapes, such as set, not teeth, but swords on edge." [68]

The end of the Tudor period saw the turning-point in Irish history, in that the grievances connected with religion and land laid the foundation of Irish national sentiment, which, from henceforth, was hostile to England. As a political venture the Plantation in Ulster had a curious and unlooked-for result, which was of significance in English, if not in European, history. The democratic and puritanical sympathies of the Scottish colonists led to their successful opposition to both Charles I. and James II. in Ireland, which assuredly turned the scales against the Stuart Monarchy, and so helped to secure the triumph of English constitutionalism. In the eighteenth century Ulster, as the leader of Irish Liberalism against English colonial policy, again found itself in opposition to the Crown, and to-day takes up a similar standpoint, though with changed motives.

The ultimate explanation of Irish politics must be found in the past, but if the Plantation in Ulster was an injustice and an error, it was to some extent, and, at any rate from the contemporary point of view, a political necessity; in other words, the practical difficulties of the situation must always modify a criticism of Tudor policy. Now that the practice of religious toleration and the operation of the land laws have gone to the root of Irish grievances, only one problem still remains—the anomalous position of Ulster in Ireland. In the solution of a crucial difficulty one useful lesson at least may be learnt from former errors—viz., that Irish problems would more often repay a psychological or economic treatment than a policy of purely political import.

CONSTANTIA MAXWELL

[68] Sir J. Harrington, *Short View of the State of Ireland*, 1605 (ed. W. Macray), p. 15.

LUDLOW.

A Study in Local History.

Attending a "Regional Survey" meeting at Ludlow last Easter, and being asked to talk to the members on local history, I found myself studying, as on other occasions at Nottingham and Stratford, as well as in my own town of Bedford, what should be the aim of the local historian. The answer is easy enough when one knows one's own neighbourhood, for then one has but to illustrate the general course of history by local instances, and to adjust the picture of the local hero—such as Bunyan or John Howard—so as to put it in the right light. But it is a very different matter when one visits new ground, even when the place is celebrated. One goes there to learn, not to instruct. In this case one knew that Ludlow Castle was the seat of the President of the Council of the Marches of Wales; yet the bare fact is not enough, and one wanted to study the previous history, the status of the barons and the growth of their power, and thus to find out why such a Council was established, and why at Ludlow.

Now, there is usually just a suspicion of rivalry between the historian and the local historian. The one may have a general idea of English History, yet is sure to lack the special knowledge needful for the details of some particular town or district. For instance, we Bedfordians who know our own local history feel that ignorance of our local conditions, and particularly of our place-names, has seriously misled the historians of the Anglo-Saxon period, from Green onwards. Of course Green was a pioneer, and probably he tried in vain to obtain the requisite local information; but such recent writers as Professor Oman could easily have obtained it, yet have failed to explain a vital problem by being, perhaps, too proud or too self-important to ask for it. On the other hand, the local man is apt to exaggerate the importance of his own town, and, knowing that it was a prominent place in one period of history, strains himself to prove that it was always prominent. Then he resents the criticisms

of an outsider who dares to dictate to the residents. Thus the earnest student is the loser, for he fails, when there is a quarrel, to get the right perspective. In the case of Ludlow the fine work of Eyton and Wright and Clive belongs to a previous generation. These men were pioneers, and therefore are beyond criticism, but they are not always safe guides in details; in particular, I was much surprised to find none of them giving any information as to whether Ludlow had ever been a parliamentary borough, and, if it had been, who was the King to whom it owed the privilege; also none of them knew of the "law of Breteuil," for Miss Bateson's articles appeared after their time.

I like to put to myself two questions when I visit a new place. What does the county or town mean to me already? If a revolution should abolish counties and map out England into departments, what would be the new name? For instance, Nottinghamshire suggests Trent, lace, and Robin Hood; Northamptonshire suggests Nene, ironstone, and leather. Shropshire, of course, can be nothing else than Middle Severn; and what a world of meaning there is in Severn, "Sabrina fair," as one's mind runs on to Shrewsbury, with its Welsh and English bridges, the gate of entry into Powysland, the home of a great school devoted to the classics whence issued *Sabrinæ Corolla*, and then on to Milton and *Comus*, clouds with silver linings, and that dramatic picture of Sir Henry Lee and his mad fit of anger when Colonel Everard tricked him, as he thought, into an expression of admiration for the regicide poet, whilst Master Kerneguy was grinning softly in the background! Yet *Comus* was first acted on the bank of the Teme, Sabrina's feeder. Ludlow suggests *Comus* to us all, even if we have vague ideas about the Council and its President.

It is special borough history that we have to study here rather than county history. The origin of Ludlow is quite clear. It grew up above an important ford which is at some considerable distance down-stream from the Norman castle, and a little distance down-stream from the bridge between Ludlow and Ludford; the said bridge climbs from a low bank at Ludlow to a steep bank at Ludford, an impossible place for a ford. "Old Street" leads to-day straight up from this old ford. Cross-country pre-Roman tracks, which have been mapped out by Mr. Harold Peake, converge on it. The problem for us to settle now is the date of the burgh. Did some pre-Roman encampment guard the ford with a ring of earthworks on the high

ground and a *tête de gué* on the other bank, as at Dorchester on the Thames; or a Roman settlement, as at Kenchester; or an Anglo-Saxon "burh," as at Wallingford, where the Normans afterwards erected a castle in an angle; or—here seems to be the right answer—did a town grow alongside a Norman castle in a position where no important pre-Norman work can be traced?

The district abounds in pre-Roman earthworks which bear witness to a considerable population and strife between the stone-age and the bronze-age men, and later between Britons and Romans. One has but to mention the two Caer Caradocs and the Bury Ditches at Lydbury North as possible sites of the defeat of Caractacus by the Romans. But no proper record has been kept here of pre-Roman remains. Though Mr. Peake shows how the old tracks run down to the ford, we have no signs of an encampment near at hand. Leland, indeed, quotes a document to show that, when in 1199 the Norman church on the crown of the ridge was being enlarged, a sepulchral barrow had to be cleared away, but it is common enough to find a barrow on some conspicuous but lonely site acting as a landmark as well as proclaiming that some chieftain had there his last home.

Similarly there are no traces of Roman, or Romano-British, occupation. The Roman soldiers at a very early date laid out Watling Street to strike the Severn at Wroxeter, and also a great western road to Gloucester and onwards to Caerleon-on-Usk. Wroxeter was the headquarters camp of the 14th and Caerleon of the 2nd legion, and as the 14th was recalled from Britain as early as A.D. 68, it is clear that the cross-road, Wroxeter-Leintwardine-Kenchester-Abergavenny-Caerleon, was laid down to connect the two military centres at a very early date of the Roman occupation whilst the fierce Silurians were still unconquered. This Roman cross-road misses Ludlow. It is traced for a few miles alongside the Shrewsbury-Church Stretton-Craven Arms-Ludlow-Hereford branch of the London and North-Western Railway, but Leintwardine is separated from Ludlow by some miles of upland. The interest here is that the Romans and the modern railway engineers were, with different objects, connecting different terminuses, and the lines coincide for a short space.

Yet again, Ludlow has no place in Mercian history. Offa's Dyke is some little distance away. In the recovery of Mercia from the Danish peril we might expect to find a "burh" erected

here. Now many an early Anglo-Saxon chieftain gave his own name with "burh" as suffix to the place which he occupied, often an old pre-Roman camp, *e.g.*, *Badda* to *Baddanbyrig*, now Badbury (*byrig* being dative case), but in early Anglo-Saxon history, 500–800 or thereabouts, the word gives us no more than the idea of personal residence. With the Danish conquest a new meaning comes in. The famous "Five Boroughs" were military centres fortified by the Danes to overawe the conquered Saxons. Then when Alfred and his descendants—particularly his heroic daughter Ethelfleda, the lady of the Mercians—drove back the Danes, they in their turn created burghs as centres to which the men of the district could rally if the Danes should invade again, or, in the eastern parts of England, as fortresses to hold the Danes down. There can be no doubt about Warwick and Worcester and Chester, around which were grouped districts of land "sheared" off as shires and named from them; nor about Scrobbesbyrig or Shrewsbury, which gave its name to Shrewsburyshire or Shropshire. As a matter of fact, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle does not mention Shrewsbury as a creation of Ethelfleda herself, though it does tell us that she created Bridgnorth as a burgh. The point, however, for us is that there is no sign or hint in the Chronicle or elsewhere that Ludlow was ever an Anglo-Saxon burgh in this sense. The very difficulty which we shall have to discuss shortly about the Ludlow of Domesday Book is sufficient to show us that, even if there was a Saxon Ludlow, it was quite unimportant. Of course the name is Saxon; even if no authority has yet explained "Lud," "low" is acknowledged as *hlaw*, *i.e.*, rising ground or mound, the ridge where was the pre-Roman sepulchral barrow mentioned above; and of course the "ford" of Ludford is Saxon.

But, says Eyton, there was a Saxon mint at Lude or Luda where coins were turned out in abundance from the reign of Ethelred II. to that of the Confessor—a strong argument if it can be substantiated. The mint marks on these coins are "LYDE," "LYDA," "LYDAFORD." But the "Y" is quite unlike the "V" of contemporary "LVNDON" coins; the same symbols and styles and some of the same mint-masters' names are those of coins of Totnes and Barnstaple; in fact, the mint was neither at Ludford nor at Ludlow, but at Lydford in Devon, which is an acknowledged Anglo-Saxon burgh and appears in the "Burghal Hidage" list. This information was given to me at the British Museum and is beyond dispute, so that the last argument for an Anglo-Saxon origin of Ludlow as an important

burgh vanishes. Eyton was not unique in his wish to prove the antiquity of his favourite place, and in his day it was customary to attribute to Anglo-Saxon influence whatever could be so attributed, so that the importance of the Normans might be minimised. We know more about the Normans now, though it is not necessary for us when we accept, let us say, some of the facts of Mr. Round to jeer at the out-of-date Anglo-Saxon sympathies of a Freeman and an Eyton.

Whatever the Norman Conquest did for the rest of England, on the borders of Wales at least it brought in a race of energetic leaders whose duty was to reduce the Marches from lawlessness to order. The Norman baron is seen at his best and his worst in this part of the world. His chief characteristic was intense energy and activity. He always seemed to want to be up and doing, and in the two hundred years between William I. and Edward I. the history of this region is the history of the spread of Norman civilisation. But we have to be careful as to its direction. The Normans conquered very little of mid-Wales, except what the Mortimers conquered towards the upper Wye and the upper Severn. Their main advance was by water from Bristol or by the Roman roads from Gloucester into South Wales. The very numerous castles of Shropshire and Herefordshire strike us as planned to beat back the Welsh from England rather than to be bases of an advance into Wales, again with the exception of the Mortimer castles, which, indeed, must be dated as considerably later than the Conquest. The Lacys never penetrated from their castles at Ludlow and Weobley far into Wales.

We all know that the Norman influence began during the reign of Edward the Confessor, when Norman favourites were introduced in large numbers into England, thereby arousing the anger of Godwin and Harold. A certain Richard Fitz Scrob or Scroope threw up in Herefordshire the great mound of Richard's Castle, and there was another fortress of this type at Ewyas Harold. But it was under the Norman kings themselves that the whole district was studded with castles, originally (there can be little doubt in the minds of those who have studied the question) mound-and-court castles, on which, in course of time, were erected works of stone, but where at first timber defences were alone possible. They served the double purpose of defence against the Welsh and suppression of the Saxons. Cheshire, Shropshire, and Herefordshire, we also all know, were constituted by William I. as counties of a special type to which after-

wards the name "palatine" was given; to bring them into line with the rest of England we add that Kent, the five divisions or "rapes" of Sussex, the barony of Basing in Hampshire, Cornwall, and Durham, were either palatine or quasi-palatine in the sense that they were conferred by the Conqueror upon individual great barons whom he could trust to be loyal. In other parts of England he gave scattered pieces of land to each of his followers, a manor here and a manor there, whether in parts of the same county or in different counties, so that no one should be strong enough by having all his land in one place to raise a force in defiance of his King. But on the borders of Wales and opposite to the coast of France, as well as in the extreme north and south-west of England, he put in great men whom he trusted as lords of united blocks of land. Thus Earl Roger of Montgomery was lord of seven-eighths of the land of Shropshire with the duty before him of conquering towards mid-Wales or Powysland. A few Norman barons held small portions of land in chief, but they also held as sub-tenants of Earl Roger. For instance, Walter de Lacy, and his son Roger after him, had 36½ hides of land in chief and 41 as sub-tenant; Ralph Mortimer held 64½ in chief and 36½ as sub-tenant. The same state of affairs must have prevailed originally in Herefordshire, where the Conqueror put in Earl William Fitz Osbern. He is recorded in Domesday Book as strengthening Ewyas Castle and as constructing various castles, which apparently he trusted to subordinate barons. His home was at Breteuil in Normandy, and he introduced to Hereford the laws and customs of Breteuil. But he died fifteen years before Domesday Book was compiled, and his son Roger was a rebel against William I., so that Herefordshire ceased to be a county palatine, and we find in Domesday Book a group of barons holding lands in chief which apparently in Earl William's time they held under him. Now Earl Roger's son in Shropshire was likewise a rebel, but at a much later date, namely, against Henry I., so that Shropshire likewise ceased to be a county palatine; but in the days of Domesday Book the one was still palatine, the other was an ordinary county such as its neighbours, Gloucestershire and Worcestershire, and thus we have an interesting contrast.

The two barons whose holdings should be mentioned in detail are Lacy and Mortimer. Lacy's total estate was 36½ hides in chief, 41 as Earl Roger's sub-tenant, 3 as the Bishop of Hereford's sub-tenant in Shropshire, 163½ in chief in Herefordshire, 71½ in Gloucestershire, 12 in Worcestershire, and 14¼ in Berk-

shire; and 2 hides at "Lude," which he held as the sub-tenant of Osbern Fitz Richard. His total amounts to 343¾ hides, a very large holding, smaller than those of a few of the very greatest Norman earls, but considerably greater than the holdings of what we may call average Norman barons in other parts of England.[1] For this land he owed the service of 51 knights; that is to say, his descendant 100 years later acknowledged that number as what he owed to King Henry II. As a matter of fact, Henry II. tried to tax him on 62 knights, and this seems to have been a source of considerable dispute between that king and his barons, but at any rate the Lacy of that date maintained successfully that his obligation was 51. Apparently they were distributed 25 for Herefordshire and 26 for the other counties. Similarly, Ralph Mortimer held 64½ hides in Shropshire in chief and 36½ under Earl Roger, 37 in Herefordshire (besides 9 hides which are entered as waste, and therefore not taxable), 37 in Hampshire, 19 in Berkshire, 43½ in Wiltshire, 3½ in Somerset, 14 in Oxfordshire, and 3 in Warwickshire, together with 120 carucates in Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, and Leicestershire; a gross total of 378 hides and carucates as units of taxable land. Osbern Fitz Richard, son of the aforementioned Richard Fitz Scrob, held 27½ hides in Shropshire in chief and 5¼ under Earl Roger, and 17½ in Herefordshire, besides his castle; in Domesday Book it is called the Castle of Auretone, but the name of Richard's Castle has survived; Auretone is now presumably Orleton, a neighbouring village. Domesday tells us that he had 23 men in the castle, and centuries later his descendants were regularly taxed on 23 or 24 knights when scutage was imposed.

In the Shropshire chapter of Domesday there is no mention of Ludlow or of any place that could even suggest Ludlow, but a few miles to the north Roger de Lacy held the very large manor of Stanton. Now in the Herefordshire chapter Osbern Fitz Richard is entered as holding both "Lude" and "Ludeford." Ludford was in Herefordshire for a long time, in fact, up to a quite recent date, but Ludlow has always in history been in Shropshire. The suggestion, therefore, is that Osbern had his Herefordshire property extending from Richard's Castle up to the Teme as the county boundary, but with a bit of land on the north bank of the river to secure the other side of the ford. Ludford he held in chief, but "Lude" he allowed Lacy to occupy as his sub-tenant as an appendage to the great manor of Stanton further north. Neither place was of much importance.

[1] *E.g.* the Beauchamp barony, about 200 hides for a service of 45 knights.

Lude was assessed at 2 hides; there were two ploughs on the demesne; one villein, a *prepositus* or lord's bailiff, and a smith had amongst them two ploughs; the land was worth 25*s*. in the days of the Confessor, and 30*s*. when Domesday Book was drawn up. The land at Ludford was 1 hide; there were two ploughs on the demesne, and five bordars had one plough; the value was 20*s*. We have, then, to assume that Lacy, a much richer and more important man than Osbern, asserted himself and became tenant-in-chief, and built a castle at Lude or Ludlow, thus making an obscure place important.

All this seems clear enough, but then comes Mr. Round's argument. This north corner of Herefordshire was a detached portion of "Cutesthorne" Hundred, but most of the land of the Hundred lay in a semi-circle N.W. to S.E. of the city of Hereford, and in this part there were two other portions of Lacy land named Lude, one of 2 hides and the other of 1 hide, which, when added to the 2 hides of the Lude already described, would give a compact 5-hide manor, viz., the manor of Lyde, 3 miles north of Hereford. Therefore, argues Mr. Round, it is a mere piece of guesswork if we take the other Lude to be Ludlow just because it happens to be entered in Domesday Book next to the entry of Ludford. His argument seems to be supported by the *Testa de Nevill*, which gives us details of the 13th century. By this date the "Cutesthorne" Hundred has disappeared, and Walter de Lacy then holds land at Lude in "Grimeswrosue" Hundred, which must be Lyde near Hereford, because the detached fragment of "Cutesthorne" has been added to the Hundred of "Wulfeye." Thereupon Mr. Round declares that Ludlow formed part of the great manor of Stanton, which must have extended right down to the north bank of the Teme, and that Lacy, when he built a castle, did not choose a site in the middle of his manor, but on the cliff overhanging the river in the extreme corner of it. Stanton[1] is registered in Domesday Book as worth £25; Siward, a free man, had held it under Edward the Confessor; there was land for 50 ploughs, and there were 136 free men and serfs living on the manor.

Mr. Round says that he is convinced that his is the right explanation. Yet his conviction is not absolute proof. He is himself very intolerant if anyone puts forward a theory that is not proved up to the hilt; yet he has here produced a theory which he has by no means proved. A fact which he has himself passed by unnoticed, but which the translator of Domesday Book in the Herefordshire V.C.H. has put very clearly before

[1] There are details of Anglo-Saxon work in the parish church of Stanton.

us, is that another entry of land in "Cutesthorne" Hundred tells us that the Bishop of Hereford held 2 hides at "Leode"; both the translator and the gentleman who made the Domesday map for the book assume that Leode is Lyde. This is a patch of 2 hides; add them to Lacy's 2 hides and 1 hide, and we get the orthodox symmetrical 5-hide manor that Mr. Round loves, leaving the first Lude entry to refer to Ludlow. That the men of Domesday Book should write "Lude" twice and "Leode" once is not surprising. Whether the officials who sent in the returns of the Bishop's land and of Lacy's land chose the one to spell "Leode" and the other to spell "Lude," or whether the clerks who actually wrote Domesday Book happened to give different spellings, matters not. Nobody would say that Mr. Round's theory is proved to be wrong, but the evidence is not clear that he is necessarily right, though he argues in his most positive and even offensive manner. Is it worth while to waste time in discussing such points? Most historians will acknowledge that such time is not wasted. The discussion of a difficulty makes us understand Domesday in a way that nothing else can, and when, in studying local history, we come up against a disputed point and argue to find the truth, it is a sign of interest, not of mere fuss over an unimportant detail.

Now whether Lacy built his castle of Ludlow in a corner of his great manor of Stanton which he held in chief, or on a piece of land adjoining Stanton which he held as Osbern's sub-tenant, there is no doubt that he was the builder of our castle. Sir W. St. John Hope gives the reign of Rufus as the date of the earliest work. To the early castle was attached some sort of hamlet, growing to be a small town in course of time, stretching from the castle bluff along the ridge where was the sepulchral barrow to a point opposite to the old ford. Then, when this town was walled in, the wall ran to enclose the top of the ridge from the castle up to the "old street." The whole course of these walls can be traced now, and the moat was just a few yards east of and parallel to Old Street.

The castle is of a familiar kind, a typical Norman keep and outworks. It is a very small keep, but of the same pattern as the big keeps of Hedingham or Corfe. Elsewhere in Shropshire and Herefordshire the mound-and-court pattern is very common. As a matter of fact, when a baron wanted to make a fortress in a hurry, it was an easy thing for him to arrange his men in a circle, dig a ditch, and throw up the soil inwards so as to form a mound; but it was not necessary for Lacy to do anything of

the sort, for the cliff overhanging the Teme was already a natural fortress in itself.[1]

The town of Ludlow falls into a very interesting class of burghs. Now most of the pre-Norman burghs, we see from Domesday Book, were royal, and, though one thinks that they were originally created as central fortresses in each district against the Danes, they gradually obtained certain customs and had to pay to the King certain dues. But a group of towns on the borders of Wales has special interest, for they enjoyed the "law" or the "laws and customs" of Breteuil. As William Fitz Osbern came from Breteuil and was Earl of Hereford, and as we find these laws prevalent in Hereford, we want no further argument as to who introduced them. The passage in Domesday Book is to the effect that the English burgesses of Hereford have their former customs, but the French burgesses—*i.e.*, the Norman followers of the new Norman earl—cannot be forced to pay fines beyond the limit of 12 pence except for breach of the King's peace and heinfar and foresteal; Rhuddlan, on the river Clwyd in North Wales, enjoyed "the laws and customs which are in Hereford and Breteuil," that is to say, the limiting of fines to 12 pence except for homicide and theft and heinfar.[2] A charter of King John, dated 1205, says that "lands and houses be held under the law of Breteuil and the law of the barony and the law of Englishry" at Shrewsbury; Domesday Book tells us that both English-born and French-born burgesses live in Shrewsbury. An Assize Roll of 6 Henry III. tells us that a law-suit at Ludlow had its origin in a man giving one mark with his daughter in frankmarriage "according to the law of Breteuil."[3] At Drogheda in Ireland, which was a Lacy foundation and the capital of the Lacy barony of Meath, King Edward III. confirmed an old Lacy charter by which "the free law of Breteuil" was given to the town. Two quite little places in Shropshire, Burford on the Teme not far from Ludlow, and Ryton further north in the county, were held in 1086 by Osbern Fitz Richard, and each had in later days a confirmatory charter conceding the same laws and customs. There are many other places where this special law prevailed, but they do not concern us. One would argue that a group of Norman lords on the Welsh border saw the importance of attracting to old or new burghs Normans who should live under a very lenient law, and receive

[1] Those who have never been to Ludlow perhaps do not know of the unique round Norman chapel in the inner ward of the castle.

[2] *Heinfar* is burglary, and *foresteal* is assault from ambush.

[3] Eyton tells us of this suit, but writes "the law of Bristol."

very light punishments for all offences except the three serious ones. Miss Bateson, who originally called our attention to Breteuil, would seem to spread the influence of these laws very widely, and it is thought by a more recent writer, the late Mr. Adolphus Ballard, that the laws and customs of other towns in Normandy and in England had a good deal in common.[1] But the fact remains that a special type of town-law was applied to our district, spreading thence into Wales and into Ireland in the track of the Norman-Welsh invaders.

It seemed as if the Lacy family was going to lose possession of Ludlow when Roger rebelled against William Rufus, and various lords were in possession in the reigns of Henry I. and Stephen. But, finally, Ludlow was restored, before Henry II. became king, to a Lacy, who was the son of Roger's sister; his son, Hugh, was lord of Ludlow and went over to Ireland after Strongbow's conquest, and Meath was granted to him by Henry II. His son in turn, by name Walter, held from 1189 up to 1241, and then the inheritance was divided between his two granddaughters, Maud, who married Geoffrey de Geneville (Joinville), brother of the French historian of the Crusades, and Margery, who married John de Verdun. During the Welsh wars of Edward I. Geoffrey was a conspicuous fighter, acting as assistant Marshal in 1282; and later on he was Marshal in 1297, when Edward I. went over to Flanders and the Earl of Norfolk refused either to go with the King or to hang. His granddaughter Joan married Roger Mortimer, who thus obtained the one half of the Lacy property, and afterwards, by exchange and purchase, got the other half from the Verduns. The Lacys, powerful as they were in Ireland and on the English side of the border, never conquered much land in Wales, but the Mortimers had gradually acquired a great deal and had several castles in the present Radnorshire and Montgomeryshire. Thus Ludlow and Weobley and Ewyas Lacy were now united to Wigmore and the wide Mortimer Marches in mid-Wales. It was one or other of these Mortimers who added so largely to the previously small castle of Ludlow, and in particular built the banqueting hall. They made Ludlow the head of their barony. In course of time the marriage of Anne Mortimer with the Earl of Cambridge brought the whole Mortimer inheritance to the House of York.

In discussing the details of any civil war we are apt to find the local historian ready to magnify the importance of this or

[1] Miss Bateson's articles are in the *English Historical Review*, Vols. xv. and xvi.; Mr. Ballard's is in Vol. xxx. October, 1915.

that petty fight which took place in his neighbourhood. The best question to put to oneself is, Did such a fight really influence the course of the war, or was it a mere skirmish? Now, in the case of the Wars of the Roses, the two local fights were really of very great importance. The Yorkists in 1459 rallied to Ludlow, and thither came the Earl of Warwick himself straight from Calais with a body of veteran and experienced soldiers. But either these veterans were not to be trusted or an unaccountable spirit of panic seized them; the Yorkist army melted away in what is known as the "Rout" or the "Panic" of Ludford, and the Lancastrian forces entered and pillaged the town. It was some little time before the Yorkist party recovered from the effects, but towards the end of 1460 the son of the Duke of York made a great recovery and won the victory of Mortimer's Cross, which was a prelude to his march on London, his assumption of the crown as Edward IV., and his crowning victory at Towton.

The lords of Ludlow were now Kings of England, and Ludlow profited thereby. For the first time in its history it was now a royal borough, not a town dependent upon the will of its feudal lord. Its residents had previously been known as burgesses, but they were now royal burgesses, and received their first royal charter in 1461, by which they gained considerable privileges in self-government. But more important is the creation of Ludlow by Edward IV. as a parliamentary borough. Up to the reign of Henry VI. Shrewsbury and Bridgnorth sent burgesses to Parliament, and in 1459 Shrewsbury alone was represented. No returns are to be found in Edward IV.'s reign before 1472. In that year Shrewsbury, Bridgnorth, and Ludlow were represented each by two Members in the House of Commons, and Much Wenlock by one. In 1529 Henry VIII. promoted Much Wenlock to two Members, and Queen Elizabeth in 1584 summoned two from Bishop's Castle. In the Long Parliament Ralph Goodwyn and Charles Baldwyn were Members for Ludlow; as their places were afterwards taken by Thomas Mackworth and Thomas Moore, it is clear that both of them were Royalists, as, in fact, were all the Shropshire representatives. The Cavalier cause was nowhere more ardently supported than here, but there is no local history of any importance in the great Civil War.

We now come to the question of the Council of the Marches. Edward I. undoubtedly wished to crush the privileges of the marcher lords, those men of Norman lineage who had been allowed by previous Kings of England to conquer and to hold

as their own such land as they were able to conquer from the Welsh. Such men had on their march estates full *jura regalia*, holding their own courts and claiming as their dearest privilege their right to wage private war at will. It was this privilege in particular that Edward I. wished to suppress, but he was unable to do so, because of his dependence on his barons and lords when he wished to make war, for instance, upon Scotland. In the great crisis of 1297 and 1298 two great earls and many barons with them defied him and called on him to confirm the charters, their original grievance being that he had after his Welsh wars tried to suppress their privileges in the marches. Edward II. was much too weak to suppress them, and from one reign to another we find the marcher lords triumphantly independent of the King. But with the victory of the House of York matters were changed. The House of Lancaster had by confiscation and marriage amassed an immense amount of march land, especially in Monmouth and Brecknock, and the House of York possessed the whole of the Mortimer property. Therefore, when the King of England, by right both of his own great possessions and of the confiscated possessions of the rival house was himself the very strongest marcher lord, he could do what his predecessors had vainly wanted to do. It is thus in the reign of Edward IV. that we find the Council first prominent. Many a previous Prince of Wales had had a Council, partly for his guidance, partly to act in his name in case he were absent from Wales. But the conditions of Edward IV.'s time were new. We have a King powerful enough to impose his will both on the lawless Welsh and on the marcher lords, a boy prince, the ill-fated Edward V. of "Tower" fame, quite unable to execute his father's will, and consequently a Council having to do the work. In 1473 the head of the Council was Alcock, Bishop of Worcester, who is styled President, not Lord President. Then under Henry VII. the conditions are the same; a powerful King, holding the Lancastrian marches by right, and the Yorkist or Mortimer marches by conquest, and a boy prince, first Arthur and then Henry. When the latter becomes Henry VIII., Mary is Princess of Wales. Consequently the Council is ever stronger and stronger. The President becomes Lord President, and when a King like Henry VIII. puts in a strong man for a definite purpose, the office is magnified. Such a man was Rowland Lee, Bishop of Lichfield, once a *protégé* of Wolsey. He is described as "stowte of nature, readie-witted, roughe in speeche, desirous to gayne credit with the Kinge. . . . Then was this Counsell moche feared, reverenced, and hadd in estimacion of the Walshe

as at this day the Starre Chamber of the English." He was "perhaps the most striking example, even under the Tudors, of the secularised prelate." For instance, he confessed himself that he had never previously been in a pulpit until he wished to preach himself against the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome.[1] Such a man was not likely to be squeamish, and during his nine years of office, 1534–1543, he made the power of his Council really felt. Henry VIII. also shired the whole of Wales, adding to the old shires of Wales Anglesey, Carnarvonshire, Merionethshire, Carmarthenshire, Cardiganshire, and to the two old palatine earldoms, Glamorgan and Pembroke, march lands which became Monmouthshire, Brecknock, Radnorshire, Montgomeryshire, Denbighshire, and Flintshire; all of them he summoned to send Members to the Commons, as well as the chief borough of each. Moreover, Shropshire, Herefordshire, and Gloucestershire came under the jurisdiction of the Council, and it seems to have tried to extend its power even over Cheshire, which had always been a special palatine county.

After Rowland Lee, William Herbert, Earl of Pembroke, grandson of the Sir William Herbert who had been one of the strongest partisans of Edward IV., was Lord President for two short spells, but the most celebrated man in this office was Sir Henry Sydney, from 1559 to 1586. "Bishop Lee had made himself feared by his rigorous suppression of crime; Sydney made himself loved by his justice and mercy." He added to Ludlow Castle the great range of Elizabethan buildings which can be seen alongside the Mortimer banqueting hall and other chambers. Another Earl of Pembroke, son of the previous one, was Lord President after Sir Henry, and married as his third wife the famous Mary Sydney, Sir Henry's daughter, who is known by Ben Jonson's epitaph. The Earl of Bridgwater was Lord President in 1634, when *Comus* was first acted in the banqueting hall, September 29th, 1634. Such a powerful Court at this time was sure to attract enemies, and attacks were made upon it in the Long Parliament at the same time as upon the Star Chamber and the Court of the North. It may be a little difficult for us to understand how such a body was popular in one age and disliked in another, for it seems to have done its work equally well, even if severely, at all periods. On the one side was the outcry that the Welsh should be kept in order; on the other side the cry that the lords marchers should be restrained from tyrannising over the Welsh. What is "protection" in one age becomes "tyranny" in another. It must be added that the

[1] Dr. Skeel, *The Council in the Marches*, p. 60 and *passim*.

Council was not absolutely independent; its decisions could be over-ridden by the Privy Council and by the Star Chamber, and its interference seems to have been resented by some of the ordinary courts, and in particular, as suggested above, by the authorities of Cheshire.

Ludlow may be said to have been the official seat of the Lord President, and a Record Office was established there; but the Council met also at Bewdley and Shrewsbury, and sometimes at Hereford, Worcester, Gloucester, Tewkesbury, Hartlebury, Bridgnorth, Oswestry, and Wrexham. The Lord President also had a palace, on which a considerable amount of money was spent at different periods, at Tickenhill, near Bewdley.

The Council was restored, but not in its former glory, after the Restoration of Charles II. It was eventually abolished shortly after the coming of William III. From that date onwards Ludlow suffered as other provincial towns have suffered. There was no reason why any great man should live there, and the wealth of the country was attracted towards the Court in London. The castle fell into decay. Probably anybody who was in want of stone to patch up his own residence looked upon its buildings as a quarry. The love of antiquities is a very modern one, and even nowadays we often enough find that the people of a district have no sense of the value of some building in their midst, and would rather pull it down to improve their own property than preserve it for the delectation of tourists, unless, indeed, it is a celebrated building which brings many tourists and their money. In 1832 Ludlow lost its two Members of Parliament, but one of the Earls of Powys was patriotic enough to buy up the property for the good of the nation, and the ruins of the castle are now kept in repair, and the townsmen are certainly conscious of the fact that Ludlow is historical as well as quaint and beautiful. It is now just an ordinary market town on an important branch line of the London and North-Western Railway; it is a centre to which carriers drive their carts from all the villages within a radius of over a dozen miles. It is not uniformly beautiful, for many commonplace houses separate the beautiful half-timbered houses for which Shropshire is justly celebrated. The entire circuit of its walls can be traced. One gate still stands, though much hidden by later buildings, and the beauty of the scenery of the river Teme can never be destroyed. The church, on the highest ground of the ridge, has a lantern and steeple visible from miles around, an outward sign that Ludlow is still the centre of its district.

J. E. Morris.

NOTES AND NEWS.

In our July number we indicated the preliminary steps which had been taken by the Historical Association to secure the co-operation of the Classical, English, Geographical, and Modern Language Associations for the defence of humanistic studies. A meeting was held of representatives of the five associations at the rooms of the Historical Association on July 17 with Professor Tout in the chair. The Classical Association was represented by Sir Frederick Kenyon, Dr. Mackail, and Mr. R. W. Livingstone; the English by Dr. A. C. Bradley, Mr. John Buchan, and Mr. John Bailey; the Geographical by Mr. Fairgrieve, Mr. Mackinder, and Miss E. J. Rickard; the Historical by Mr. C. H. Greene, Mr. Marten, and Professor Tout; and the Modern Language by Mr. G. F. Bridge, Mr. H. L. Hutton, Dr. W. Perrett, and Dr. F. Storr.

* * * * * *

The official report of the Conference is as follows :—

August 31, 1916.

The following resolutions, drawn up by a Conference representative of the five associations concerned, have received the approval of the Councils of the Classical, English, Geographical, Historical and Modern Language Associations. They are intended to form a basis for common action by the five associations as well as, it is hoped, for co-operation with representatives of the mathematical and natural sciences and of other elements in education. It must, therefore, be understood that they do not represent the full views of the associations concerned, but rather a common measure of their views, which they all accept as a basis. In the same way the propositions laid down do not profess to cover the whole field of education, but are limited to the spheres with which the five associations directly deal. Some apology, moreover, seems needed for the use of such contrasted terms as "humanistic" and "scientific." They are simply employed for the sake of brevity, for all would agree that "humanistic" studies should be scientific, and "scientific" studies humane.

The resolutions are now published in the hope that in any coming reconstruction of our educational system this attempt to restate the "humanistic" position will mitigate the dangers incident to a violent breach of tradition and an excessive reaction against the past predominance of certain types of study.

It will be obvious that they are drawn up in no spirit of hostility or indifference to either scientific or technical studies. Their framers are anxious to co-operate in securing for these, as well as for the studies in which they are themselves more particularly interested, their due place in a national system of education.

Pending the formation of some central council, which could assume a larger responsibility and speak with a wider representative authority, they would welcome offers of co-operation or suggestions for the further practical development of the position taken in these resolutions.

Any communication may be addressed to the Chairman of the Conference of the Five Associations, Professor Tout, 1, Oak Drive, Fallowfield, Manchester.

The resolutions are as follows : That in the opinion of the conference :—

(i) It is essential that any reorganisation of our educational system should make adequate provision for both humanistic and scientific studies.

(ii) Premature specialisation on any one particular group of studies, whether humanistic or scientific, to the exclusion of all others, is a serious danger, not only to education generally, but to the studies concerned.

(iii) Humanistic education implies the adequate study of language and literature, geography, and history, which in each case should, at the appropriate stage of education, go beyond the pupil's own language and country.

(iv) The representatives of humanistic studies would welcome from the representatives of the mathematical and natural sciences a statement with regard to those studies similar to that contained in (iii).

(v) In all reform of education it must never be forgotten that the first object is the training of human beings in mind and character, as citizens of a free country, and that any technical preparation of boys and girls for a particular profession, occupation or work must be consistent with this principle.

(vi) Subject to the above principles the associations concerned would welcome a comprehensive revision of national education from the point of view of present needs.

The report is signed by Viscount Bryce and Sir Frederic G. Kenyon (Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum) on behalf of the Classical Association; by Earl Cromer and Mr. John Buchan on behalf of the English Association; by Mr. Douglas W. Freshfield and Mr. H. J. Mackinder, M.P., on behalf of the Geographical Association; by Professor C. H. Firth and Professor T. F. Tout on behalf of the Historical Association; and by Mr. Edmund Gosse and Sir Herbert Warren (President of Magdalen College, Oxford) on behalf of the Modern Language Association.

* * * * * *

It is a matter of no little satisfaction to the Historical Association that it should have initiated a movement which has met with such comprehensive and influential support; and the unanimity of the five associations is as welcome as the resolutions of the Conference are admirable. Different associations and individuals will no doubt differ in the importance they attach to the various resolutions; but we are inclined to regard (v) and (ii) as the most fundamental. The first resolution is a truism which none but the most bigoted specialist will deny; the third is a definition which is almost equally indisputable; the fourth is a polite but pointed and necessary invitation; and the sixth absolves the Conference from any charge of hide-bound conservatism.

* * * * * *

The fifth strikes at the root of the controversy as it appears to students of the humanities in a free country. Education cannot without disastrous results be merely a matter of bread-and-butter studies and technical equipment. The child is not merely father of the man, but also of the family and of the State; and

the mere technician, whether a philologist, a stylist, a chemist, or an engineer, is necessarily a bad citizen. *Respublica res populi*, and the indifference of the specialist to public affairs involves a danger which education should seek to prevent and not to provoke.

* * * * * *

The second resolution really follows from the fifth, and a more logical order would have been (v), (ii), (i), (iii), (iv), (vi). Premature specialisation is a danger to the studies concerned as well as to the community, but the danger to the community comes first and is more important. We have been governed in the past by monarchy and by aristocracy; we are now ruled by a bureaucracy, and there can be no really popular government without popular education in those studies which promote the understanding of public affairs. Specialisation of function without community of feeling and of judgment is the mark of a servile State. This is of course a danger to "education"; but one of our duties is to show that education is not merely the affair of teachers and pupils but the lifeblood of the public.

* * * * * *

The danger to the subjects themselves is one which comes home to the student of history. No historian imagines that it is possible to make much progress in his science without some knowledge of geography, literature, law, economics, and some acquaintance with other languages than his own, and the addition which he would most like to make to these resolutions would be the requirement of some knowledge of other ages than his own. We can have but little notion where we are or whither we are going unless we know where we were and whence we came. Indeed, others besides professed historians have recently maintained that history must be the basis of the humanistic education of the public. But that history would have to be real history, ancient and modern, in which lists of dates and kings and the committing of facts to memory are subordinated to the understanding of human affairs and the methods of ascertaining the truth.

* * * * * *

Meanwhile, the war is taking heavy toll of those to whom rising generations look for historical inspiration. Sir Foster Cunliffe, Fellow of All Souls' and first lecturer in military history in the University of Oxford, fell during the first advance on the Somme. Leonard Butler, fellow and lecturer in history at St. John's College, in the same university, was killed in August. Cambridge mourns the youngest son of the Master of Trinity, who took a brilliant degree in history and the Gladstone Prize in 1914, and also Geoffrey Reynolds Day, fellow and lecturer in history at Emmanuel College. The Public Record Office has lost Alfred E. Bland, joint-editor with Mr. R. H. Tawney (himself severely wounded) of "Documents illustrating English Economic History." An older historian, George Townsend Warner, owes his none the less premature death at the age of fifty-one to other causes than the war; his essays and verse will be familiar to some of our readers, his excellent school-books to all.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Sir,

Admiral Henderson's assertion, quoted in your second number, that "the public never has, and never will, understand naval warfare," opens up a very big question for the teacher of history. For the reason why the Admiral ploughed the whole nation in Naval History—surely the most comprehensive plough on record—is that we did not understand how large a part indecisive engagements have played in "the sea affair," and how few and far between decisive victories have been. Things get out of perspective as we look back: the past becomes greatly foreshortened. We read in our text-books a list of British victories—St. Vincent, Camperdown, Nile, Copenhagen, Trafalgar—and we forget that they were distributed over a space of eight years (roughly, a great battle once every twenty months), and that the intervening periods were filled with the movements of fleets hither and thither, manœuvres, blockades, petty engagements, indecisive actions, and much other dull and undramatic work, to make which intelligible and instructive requires a detailed examination which the teacher has not time to give. The fundamental difficulty is that what is dull and undramatic makes but a small impression on the youthful mind compared with what is striking and dramatic. It is easy enough, of course, to tell a class that Nelson's two years' vigil off Toulon was as valuable a service and as great an achievement as the battle of Trafalgar; but, however eloquent the teacher may be, it is highly probable that three-fourths of the class will forget the two years' vigil and remember only the battle. The difficulty is a psychological one, inherent in human nature. It affects the adult as much as the boy or girl. The atmosphere of romance hangs round war, and it is hard for us to dispel it. In his *Stonewall Jackson* Colonel Henderson describes how the Confederate soldiers discovered "that war is never romantic and seldom exciting, but a monotonous round of tiresome duties, enlivened at rare intervals by dangerous episodes. . . ., that a battle is an interlude which breaks in at rare intervals in the long round of digging, marching, bridge-building, and road-making, and that the time of the fiercest fire-eater is generally occupied in escorting mule-trains, in mounting guard, in dragging waggons through the mud, and in loading and unloading stores." Possibly some teachers of history are making like discoveries in France or elsewhere at this moment, discoveries by which their pupils may some day profit. But we stay-at-homes find it hard to realise these things; and how much harder must it be found by young people whose minds fasten instinctively upon the striking event, the brilliant victory or crushing defeat, whose eyes are irresistibly attracted by strong colours and turn away from neutral tints. We must face the fact that the schoolboy's understanding of history can never be anything but a very distant approximation to the reality of things.

Another question connected with instruction in military history is this: Are we to teach the truth? I will explain what I mean. In the *Cambridge Modern History* Wellington's Army at Waterloo is said by Professor Oman to have consisted of 67,000 men, of whom 24,000 were British and 28,300 Germans, the remainder being Dutch and Belgians. Now of five school text-books on my shelves, all by good authors, not one states this fact fairly. One speaks of the army as being "chiefly British and Prussians"; the second and most scandalous, but possibly the most widely used, speaks of "the English Army, 90,000 strong, opposed by 120,000 Frenchmen" (figures wildly wrong); the third says merely that the Army was "of several nationalities"; the fourth gives the number as 24,000 British and 17,000 Hanoverians; the fifth, the only one that gets near the truth, says Wellington had 85,000 men in Belgium, one-third of whom were British, and one-third German, but in the account of the battle itself alludes to the Germans only as forming the garrison of La Haye Sainte.

Again, not one of the five contains any genuine picture of the military weakness of England at the beginning of the Seven Years' War, or of the system of employing German mercenaries. A slight allusion to these things, not calculated to make any real impression on the mind, is all that I can find. One would never learn from any of these books that the history of the British Army all through the eighteenth century is a very grey one, redeemed only by a few bright patches of colour. One would never discover that for long periods of our history we were not a strong but a weak military power. The object seems not so much to teach the all-round truth about things as to excite admiration for brilliant exploits. It will be said, I suppose, that one end at least of history is to stimulate patriotism. But that is a poor patriotism which cannot bear to hear of its country's weaknesses and failures. And it is also an unintelligent patriotism, and being unintelligent does as much harm as good. For it can hardly be doubted that one reason why Englishmen have been so careless about military questions and neglectful of their army is that they have imbibed at school an exaggerated idea of British military achievements in the past. If the British Army has always been triumphant and invincible, why worry about the size and composition of it? It will no doubt do just as well again. Here, again, the difficulty is partly inherent in human nature, especially boy and girl nature. Stories of victory are assimilated with ease: stories of defeat and failure remain outside the mind. The coldest of us finds it hard to throw himself into the American War of Independence with the same ardour as into the Peninsular War.

What is really wanted to create that sense of proportion, which the student of English history alone will always lack, is the study of foreign history. We can know our own country, as we can know anything else, only by comparing it with something else. But that is too large a subject for the fag-end of a letter which may have already grown too long.

G. F. Bridge.

Sir,

There is a suggestion in the current number of History that every teacher should endeavour to do for the people of the locality what university professors try to do by means of public lectures. This is an excellent suggestion, and if it could be carried out would have

an enormous and almost immediate influence for good. But how is it to be done? The professor has advantages which, even in his own sphere, the teacher has not; for, while the former has to some extent the backing of the university, the latter has to depend upon himself, unless he joins some political organisation, which at once limits his activities; and the evening schools of the local authority hardly provide suitable opportunities for the type of work the writer of the note has in his mind. Some sort of organisation is necessary to back the individual teacher in his efforts and to give him some kind of standing. Could not the professoriate of the university, acting perhaps through the University Extension movement, or in other ways, do this work? There must be teachers among their advanced students who are quite capable of doing the work if the opportunity came to them, but who cannot of themselves make the opportunity. Here the standing and experience of the professoriate could come in; and, having got together the lecturers, it could approach the local education authorities, local branches of the W.E.A. and other bodies, and offer them single lectures or courses on the lines suggested.

Doubtless other and better ways will suggest themselves; but I do not think the individual teacher will ever be able to do anything by himself, except perhaps in very rare instances; and something of the sort must be done soon if we are to profit by the lessons the war is teaching us.

GEO. E. EADES.

[Our correspondent takes a somewhat roseate view of the "backing" of a university: when it is said that a university does this, that, or the other, it means that some individuals in the university have done them in spite of the opposition of others and the complete indifference of the vast majority. London is a difficult area to work, but the teacher should look for backing to the Historical Association, and this would seem a matter for the consideration of the Committee of the London Branch. As we suggested in our last number, the Council for the Study of International Relations affords valuable help in the organisation of study-circles and lectures on most subjects connected with history and the war; and Public Librarians have in some centres, *e.g.*, Manchester, rendered yeoman service. If the C.S.I.R. and the Committee of the London branch took up the matter, there should be means of enlisting the support of the University Extension Board and of the London County Council; strange as it may seem, there is no official connexion in London between the University Professoriate and the University Extension Board.—ED.]

Mr. E. Milburn-Cave, of Chicago, writes for "advice as to the most authentic English history of the present great war." Nothing in the nature of a really authentic history of the war will be possible for many years to come; and the natural desire of historical students that, as one of the terms of peace, the enemy chancelleries should be required to give up their official secrets is not likely to be gratified. The histories that are pouring from the Press are temporary makeshifts for truth, but some of them have considerable historical and literary merits. Mr. John Buchan's (Nelson: 1*s.* 3*d.* a volume) stands high in the list; so does Mr. Hilaire Belloc's, also published by Messrs. Nelson. Others of a less general or readable character are mentioned in our quarterly lists of new books.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

Early European Civilisation.[1] *A Textbook for Secondary Schools.* By Roscoe Lewis Ashley. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1916. Pp. 708. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.)

To relate the story of man from palæolithic times to the fall of the Roman Empire of the West in some 300 pages of large print with an illustration on every third page is perhaps an impossibility, but Mr. Ashley has made a valiant attempt to achieve the impossible. The great virtue of his book is that it is interesting; there are useful references for further reading, and the questions at the end of each chapter are refreshingly free from pedantry; often they cannot be answered from the text, but might be made extremely suggestive in the hands of a skilful teacher. At times brevity has been pushed to such lengths that it may be doubted whether the young student will really gain any useful idea of the subject—*e.g.*, from the paragraphs on Greek literature. The reader can hardly restrain a smile when the only information given him of the message of Æschylus is that "he was very much in earnest." This is not the place for detailed criticism, though there are many statements (*e.g.*, that "Thucydides wrote in clear, choice Greek that it is a pleasure to read," p. 193) that invite comment. The chapters on social life form one of the best features of the book, and it is good to find an intelligent appreciation of the importance of the Hellenistic period.

Norman Baynes.

Mediæval Civilization. By Roscoe Lewis Ashley. New York: The Macmillan Company. 411 pp. 5*s.* net.

This volume is a continuation of the author's text-book on *Ancient Civilization*. The period covered ranges from the Barbarian Invasions to the Peace of Westphalia (1648), with two supplementary chapters. The book is intended for use in American high schools, where the whole period of history is apparently to be covered in a three-year course, of which this represents the ground to be covered in one year; hence, presumably, the inclusion in an account of "mediæval civilization" of a century and a half which are not, properly speaking, mediæval at all. Text-books are at present like the eighth plague of Egypt; they cover the face of the whole of history, so that the land is darkened. The only excuse for writing a new one is that it shall not be dull and shall leave some green things upon the trees. The present book has not that excuse; it is very dull; and dulness is unnecessary, even in an outline. The account

[1] The bibliography of Mr. Ashley's work is bewildering and unexplained. Apparently he published first a text-book on *Ancient Civilisation*, which we have not received, and then a book on *Mediæval Civilisation*, which Miss Power reviews below. Then the two were issued together as *Early European Civilisation*, the first part of which is here noticed by Mr. Baynes.—Ed.

of mediæval and renaissance art, for instance, with its lists of names, is of no educational value whatever; and the sense of humour, as well as the educational sense was missing when the author permitted himself to write of Shakespeare, on p. 624, "the titles of at least several of his dramas should be remembered." The book may be useful as a cram-book. It will never awaken an interest in mediæval life.

Nevertheless, looked at purely as a cram-book it is not without merit. It is comprehensive, and on the whole accurate, its treatment of economic history is good, and it contains good maps and illustrations. Some particular points need correction. On p. 401, after explaining the difference between villein and serf to lie in the fact that the serf's services were unfixed and indefinite, the author adds: "In the earlier and rougher days of feudalism most tenants were practically serfs in England," which is not only untrue as it stands (owing to its use of the word tenant), but an exaggeration even as applied to villein-tenants. On p. 467 the difference between merchant and craft gilds should have been emphasised; no one would gather from the text that crafts grew up and replaced the merchant gild as soon as industries in any particular town were sufficiently developed to require separate organisation. A useful feature of the book is the list of works for further reading, arranged under topics at the end of each chapter. There is also a list of questions upon each chapter, but these are not always well framed; they contain too many hints in themselves (*e.g.*, "Describe a mediæval manor. To what extent was it dependent on the outside world? What did its courts do?"), and, while intended to make the pupil think, sometimes manage to be inept (*e.g.*, "Is the modern gentleman more or less chivalrous than the mediæval knight?").

E. E. POWER.

Crises in the History of the Papacy. By JOSEPH MCCABE. Putnams. 1916. 2 dollars 50 cents.

THIS is a useful and a very interesting book. Mr. McCabe is justified in saying that it would be impossible within the compass (450 pp.) to find in English even an attempt to do what he has done. "One wants a view," he says, "of the Papacy in the essential lines of its development, and they are usually lost, or not easily recognised, in the conscientiously full chronicles. Is it possible to give a useful and informing account of the *essential* history of the Papacy in a small volume?" In order to do this he has chosen twenty prominent Popes and described their work and character fairly fully, with very slight reference to the intervening names. The result is a very readable and in parts a detailed account of the activities of the chosen score, with considerable reference to the authorities for each Pope's life and period. Although Mr. McCabe's attitude is mainly critical, and of course not friendly to the Church as an institution, it should be said that on every disputed question of fact he is scrupulously impartial. He knows an enormous literature on the subject, including the latest authorities, and he is always ready, in case of reasonable doubt, to favour the accused person.

Our line of criticism would be different, and Mr. McCabe would probably reply that in making it we are asking him to write quite a different book. Perhaps we are. But the point is this. He says in his preface that he has tried in a small volume to write the

essential history of the Papacy—the italics are his own. But surely the essential history of any institution is an account of the causes which created and kept it together and of the purpose which it has served in the progress or the education of mankind. The Papacy is perhaps the most extraordinary institution in the Western world. It has survived, still powerful, though with altered and diminished splendour, the horrors and the follies and personal defects which Mr. McCabe faithfully describes, and must therefore serve some great and permanent need of men. But you will hardly find these alluded to in this book. We believe that it would have been possible, even in the narrow compass which Mr. McCabe has imposed upon himself, to have given some *rationale* of the institution, to have attempted some answer to the question, What is it all for? What is its place among the other civilising forces of the world? For this we would ourselves gladly sacrifice some of the stories about Alexander VI.[1]

F. S. Marvin.

A History of France. By J. R. Moreton Macdonald. 3 vols. Methuen. 22*s.* 6*d.*

There could hardly be a more striking contrast in the conceptions of history and of the duties of a historian than that which is presented by Mr. Moreton Macdonald's *History of France* and Green's *Short History of the English People*. We all know what Green's views were: reigns were no longer to be taken as the inevitable divisions of our history; campaigns were to be only summarised; attention was to be paid to art, thought, and social life; history was to deal with the life of the people, not merely with the government. There are interesting chapters dealing with the social life of France in Mr. Macdonald's first volume; but the other two are almost entirely concerned with politics and war.

It must be admitted that the success of a book which sets out to tell the history of France from the beginning until 1871 in three volumes depends almost as much upon the art with which it is written as upon the knowledge upon which it rests. Style counts for very much in making such a book acceptable and popular, and it would be difficult to praise too highly the style of Mr. Macdonald's book. It is not often that one finds such writing in an English historian's narrative—a style so easy, graceful, free, interesting. The writing in many places is more like that of a first-rate novelist or essayist than that which is usually found in histories. The most brilliant passages of all are those which describe the prominent characters in the story of France. They form, indeed, a remarkable portrait gallery, and they never fail to arrest attention and to fix a lively image upon the imagination, though they often provoke opposition as well as admiration. They may be taken almost at haphazard: Clovis, Charlemagne, Louis le Gros, Suger, Louis XI., Sully, Colbert, Thiers, are all excellently done. Mr. Macdonald turns away from Louis IX., abruptly and I think characteristically, with the remark that, if he goes on, his account will become mere "hagiology"; and his brilliant sketch of Louis XIV. is dangerously near

[1] It should be noted that two books, with the Catholic *imprimatur*, do attempt to give a view of the subject which Mr. McCabe treats, in about the same space: (1) McKillian's *A Chronicle of the Popes* (Bell & Co.), (2) Stebbing's *The Story of the Catholic Church* (Sands & Co.).—F. S. M.

to caricature. He stresses too much "his immense appetite and his bad teeth": when he says, "to a great extent his was the reign of a dyspeptic," he forgets for the moment that he is speaking of the longest reign in European history. But no character sketch is final; none can claim scientific accuracy. All readers of Mr. Macdonald's work will be grateful for these pictures, which have something of the brilliance and charm of Sorel. Personally I am grateful to him for praising so highly Scott's presentation of Louis XI.

Another prominent feature of the book is the attention devoted to war, and especially to the wars of the last three centuries. Battles are brilliantly described in the earlier pages. Crecy, for instance, is a masterpiece; but it is not until the age of Louis XIV. that Mr. Macdonald begins to give full military narratives with detailed accounts and criticisms of tactics and strategy. This part of the work raises some doubts in my mind. I should like someone (I will not attempt to make the nomination) to give us a series of lectures on "The Writing of History as an Art." They might really have a great and beneficial effect, and might settle some disputed points. For instance, how ought campaigns to be treated in a book that is intended for the student and the general reader? What can you make of the War of the Spanish Succession, for example, if you can only give twenty-three pages to it? Mr. Macdonald writes clearly and with expert knowledge, which is well; but he writes as if for experts, which is more questionable. The book is not too well provided with maps, and without detailed maps some of his campaigns are extremely difficult to follow. The account of the Franco-German War seems to me the best account that has ever been packed into so small a space, but I fancy most readers will find it very difficult to follow and will long for those diagrammatic maps to which Mr. Belloc's writings have accustomed us. Mr. Macdonald never hesitates to criticise the tactics and strategy of even the greatest soldiers. He can tell us where armies ought to have been sent and who ought to have been placed in command. Personally I find this method much more interesting than mere flat narrative, but there will be many to whom it will seem like a description of a game of chess to one who does not know the moves. Certainly I cannot challenge his judgments; but I often wonder at the comparative space which he allots to various military incidents. There is a full account of the fall of Quebec; a full account of Fontenoy, justified by a reference to a dictum of Napoleon that the battle prolonged the life of the monarchy; but Rossbach is dismissed in a sentence or two, though Napoleon is reported to have said that Rossbach was the real cause of the French Revolution. Naval events are treated as fully as military; but the naval engagement which brought about the surrender of the English at Yorktown is not mentioned, though I have seen it called the most important naval battle since Salamis. The Walcheren expedition is treated as a total failure, but Mr. Corbett implied an interesting defence of it in his address to the Historical Association at their last annual meeting.[1]

Another strongly marked characteristic of Mr. Macdonald's book must be mentioned. He gives curiously little attention to ideas at any period of French history. And it is clear that this is done resolutely and on system. He does not believe that "revolutions begin in the minds of men"; he does not believe that ideas govern the

[1] See above, Vol. I., pp. 13–14.

world. To one who holds the opposite view the presentation of some periods of French history contained in these volumes is rather astonishing. Mr. Macdonald keeps always on the surface. He scouts the idea that Christianity had anything to do with the disappearance of slavery, or so I interpret his words. When he turns (I. 342) to examine the condition of Europe on the eve of the Italian wars he puts us off with the political condition only. The Renaissance and the Reformation are never penetrated. But the most remarkable instance is in his treatment of the fanatical Catholicism of Paris in the sixteenth century. He actually writes: "The irreconcilable attitude of Paris is not easy to explain. Perhaps its greatest bond to the Catholic Church was the fact that the clergy had taken up the bulk of the municipal loan, and therefore any attack on the Church was a menace to the finances of Paris." It is clear that religious fanaticism is a phenomenon that Mr. Macdonald has not cared to examine, and after that one does not wonder that he fails to give any idea of Calvinism except on its political side.

But the instances of the resolute ignoring of the spiritual foundation of history could be multiplied indefinitely. The age of Louis XIV. is treated simply as politics and war. There is no hint of what makes it after all "le grand siècle." The name of Molière is only just mentioned. It is clear that Mr. Macdonald knows his Madame de Sévigné well, but he has not used her letters as a mirror of the time. I think the name of Descartes is not mentioned at all. When we come to the Revolution there is the same extraordinary lack. Mr. Macdonald knows everything except what a revolutionist was. Passion, religious or intellectual, is apparently unknown and unguessed. And so the story of the Revolution is like a show of automata, not the fierce conflict of passions and ideals which it really was. When we come to the Revolution of 1848 it is even worse. There is no hint of the new stirring of political and social passion: no effort, for instance, to show what Louis Blanc meant to Paris or to France; no mention of Saint Simon and Fourier; no hint that the Revolution was awake again. And so this part of his history seems to me a tale told by a very learned man and a charming writer, full certainly of sound and fury, but signifying very little.

The Preface, which is dated "Hôpital Temporaire, Arc-en-Barrois, 30 May 1915," tells us, what we could gather from almost any page of the book, that it was written before the cataclysm of 1914, and that it has not been reviewed in the light of the war. Certainly the author will find it hard to reprint some passages in the subsequent edition, which will soon be called for. He tells us that he feels that he has overstated the "temperamental weaknesses" of the French. He will probably not in a future edition stress the view that the French soldier is better fitted for the offensive than the defensive. This appears several times in these volumes; but Verdun has made that for ever incredible. I hope he will reconsider his view that honour rather than duty is the typical impulse of the French nation (III. 118). He will perhaps withdraw the phrase about the "notoriously excitable nerves of Paris" (III., 372).

For my own part I believe he will have to carry his recantation still further, if the work is to be as a whole, what in many ways it certainly is, the best history of France in the English language. He will have to revise his attitude to the French Revolution. He may underline its follies and its crimes; he may analyse the trivial and

unworthy motives of its leaders; but I must venture to say that he who has only seen those has not seen France. He need not recant his own views that "a king who really governs is something better than a liberator and a democratic reformer," and that order and justice are superior to liberty (I., 176). But he must realise that France was not "flippant and superficial" (II., 3) when she spoke of equality, the people, and humanity, and that as M. Maurice Barrès said to the British Academy the other day, it is her special glory, in the great crises of her history, to have worked for the human race as well as for herself.

I must not end this notice of a particularly interesting and suggestive book without warm praise for the index and the bibliography. The latter is something very different from the compilation of book-titles, which it is so easy to make. The books are carefully chosen, and given in such a way as to be most helpful to the student.

A. J. GRANT.

A History of the Modern World, 1815–1910. By OSCAR BROWNING. First published, 1912: Popular edition, 1916. Pp. 995. Cassell and Co.

THE ample proportions of Mr. Browning's portly volume distinguish it from the mass of handbooks and school-books which have poured from the press during the last few months to teach us what we ought to have known before the war broke out. Nearly a thousand pages on the history of less than a hundred years leave scope for a detailed treatment for which the improvisors of war-books have not the time nor canvas; and Mr. Browning is able to give us over eighty pages on the Franco-Prussian War, twenty-four on the Boer War, and to devote separate chapters to the Spanish-American War of 1898, the Boxer movement, and the Russo-Japanese War of 1904. It is well, too, to be able to spare separate chapters for the more pacific topics of Gladstone's first ministry and Disraeli's last; and especially for the Federation of Australia. These chapter-headings indicate the wide sweep of Mr. Browning's view of history; and yet the book is not so comprehensive as its title. Even in a thousand pages it is impossible to give eighty pages to six months of war between two powers, and at the same time to survey a century of human history from China to Peru. Peru does not, it happens, figure in these pages; nor does the Argentine or Venezuela; and after its revolt from Spain Mr. Browning has obviously been compelled to drop a continent out of the history of the modern world.

North America fares somewhat better with chapters on the Civil War, and on the war with Spain; nevertheless it is only of Great Britain that there is any domestic history since 1870, and such episodes as presidential elections are relegated to oblivion. The book is in fact really a history of Great Britain, with occasional chapters on the affairs of foreign countries when those affairs come prominently within the view of British politics. But French and German domestic politics are ignored since the Franco-Prussian War; Holland and Belgium disappear after the revolution of 1830, while Sweden and Norway do not appear in the index at all. Denmark is saved from neglect by its loss of Schleswig and Holstein, but the separation of Sweden and Norway passes without a comment. More singular is Mr. Browning's silence on Balkan affairs

since 1878. The problem of the Near East seems to drop out of his mind after the Congress of Berlin, and we hear nothing about the union of Bulgaria with Eastern Rumelia and the Serbo-Bulgar War of 1885, the blockade of Athens in 1886, the Armenian massacres of 1896, the Cretan revolution and the Turko-Greek War of 1897, the Young Turk movement, and the Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908. English party politics are treated at length; but Mr. Browning, a strenuous Liberal of the Gladstonian type, has turned a blind eye to social and economic history. But the most curious feature about his book is that it contains no account of the growth of the British Navy or of Anglo-German rivalry: indeed, the whole volume seems designed to lead up to a pacific climax, and to close with the chapter on the reign of Edward the Peacemaker as the culmination of human progress and enlightenment. "Kings and statesmen," writes Mr. Browning *à propos* of the Olympic games in London in 1908, "may do what they please, but when nations meet together in athletic sport, or friendly intercourse, in Olympic games or in Esperanto congresses, to enjoy the same amusements and speak the same language, war must gradually become impossible" (p. 951). The irony of history has seldom been reflected with more unconscious innocence in the pages of a historian.

A. F. POLLARD.

SHORT NOTICES.

A Thousand Years of Papal History, by W. E. Beet, M.A., D.Lit. (pp. 144, C. H. Kelly, 1*s.* 3*d.* net), is a brief sketch of early Papal history and a work of religious edification rather than scientific exposition. It is written from the Protestant point of view, and it depicts the Papacy as "the outcome of purely historical causes." Nevertheless, in spite of its ecclesiastical bias, it should prove useful to the student of mediæval history. For the author knows his subject thoroughly; he has gone to the original sources, and he has read widely in the literature of recent research. He brings out in clear relief the leading stages in the development of the Papal monarchy down to the pontificate of Gregory VII. Why he should stop there, in the very crisis of the Investiture Controversy, it is difficult to say. The sketch should have been carried at least to the Pontificate of Boniface VIII. It is to be hoped that Dr. Beet may find time to complete the study which he has so well begun.

F. J. C. H.

The *Book of Pirates*, by Henry Gilbert (George G. Harrap and Co., 1916. Pp. 319. Illustrations by J. Finnemore), embodies in attractive fiction accounts of the more striking and picturesque pirates from those who captured Julius Caesar to the Algerian pirates whose career was ended by the French occupation of Algiers in 1830. Saxon and Norman pirates are included with the Corsairs of the Mediterranean, the buccaneers of the Spanish Main, Captain Kidd, Edward Teach ("Blackbeard") and Captain Avery. The heading of the final section, "The Last of the Pirates," is misleading, as it deals with pirates who were disposed of a century or more before piracy

came to an end; and the title, "Buccaneers of the Spanish Main," will tend to perpetuate the popular delusion that the Spanish Main was a sea instead of *tierra firma*.

C. S. P.

Patriotic Poetry, Greek and English. By W. Rhys Roberts, Professor of Classics in the University of Leeds. J. Murray. 1916. 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

This book has for its core an address delivered on St. Crispin's Day, October 25, 1915, to the Literary and Historical Society of Leeds University. Professor Rhys Roberts treats his theme with great sanity and delicacy of taste and a learning which, while it is everywhere apparent, is never oppressive or pedantic. Both text and notes are enriched by a wealth of illustration from Greek and English prose and poetry. There is nothing definitely to criticise in the book. It is well written, and its judgments will commend themselves to any sane and scholarly reader. It is impossible, however, not to feel that, though it may well have been inspiring to listen to, when read it is a little lifeless and cold, and tells the reader less than he would gather from a small anthology. It is perhaps ungracious to make such a criticism. The bases of patriotic poetry are the same all the world over; every man loves his home, and there are few —so this war has shown—that are not prepared to risk their all for it. But to write of patriotism one requires to possess a perfection of eloquence such as has fallen to the lot of few prose writers, or that intangible and indefinable gift that makes a man a true poet. The present book does not possess these qualities, and is a little obvious and lacking in distinction. Its charm, and this was almost inevitable, depends in the main on its quotations, familiar but immortal.

There are a number of interesting notes on various topics at the end, and four illustrations which to the reviewer seem ineffective and somewhat irrelevant.

H. E. B.

Armenia: Past and Present, by W. Llew. Williams (P. S. King. 1916. Pp. xii, 211, with two maps), is a popular sketch based mainly on Mr. H. F. B. Lynch's two volumes of *Travels and Studies* and on the article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. There is an appendix consisting of a long quotation from Mr. F. W. Bussell's *Roman Empire;* but Mr. Williams seems to be unacquainted with Finlay's work on the Eastern Empire, not to mention more recondite sources; and there are some strange historical statements and mistakes in spelling. The assertion (p. 65) that "under Tigranes the Great the population of Armenia was at least 30,000,000" is preposterous; and the striking remark quoted from Lord Acton on p. 165 did not refer to Armenia but to Poland. Nevertheless, the book contains much information not generally known, and may be read with profit by those who wish to acquire some notion of the Armenian problem.

Both Mr. Sydney Herbert's *Modern Europe, 1789–1914* (Macmillan. Pp. xii, 262) and Mr. G. B. Smith's *Outlines of European History, 1814–1914* (Edward Arnold. Pp. 267, with maps), are useful sketches of the last century of European history. Mr. Herbert's deals rather with international relations than with the domestic history of the several States, and it is obviously designed

for adults who need some historical background to current politics and require some historical introduction to the study of present international relations. Mr. Smith's book is a more carefully packed account of the development of the individual countries of Europe. It is fuller of facts than Mr. Herbert's volume, and would make an excellent text-book for schools; it contains, however, no reference to the second battle of Custozza nor to the naval battle of Lissa, which is rather odd, as Mr. Smith writes at Osborne. *Per contra*, Mr. Herbert's index contains no reference to either battle of Custozza, though both are mentioned in his text (pp. 124, 183). His book is in the main a development of the sound idea that the international troubles of the nineteenth century arose mainly from the repudiation of national principles after Napoleon's fall. The effect of Napoleon's failure was to place Metternich in the saddle; and Metternich, as an Austrian, was necessarily the negation of nationality. Had the Czar Alexander been a great man, or had Castlereagh controlled the Congresses, the nationalist sympathies of England and Russia might have saved Europe from the necessity of devoting most of its energies since 1815 to the task of undoing the work of the Congress of Vienna.

In *English Influence on the United States* (Cambridge University Press. 1916. Pp. xii, 168) Dr. Cunningham has collected a series of six addresses delivered during the autumn of 1914 in the north-eastern corner of the United States, at Boston, Providence, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. They strike the reader as being somewhat discursive notes on some minor aspects of the common inheritance of the two peoples. The first three lectures dealt with The Township, Town-planning, and Public Buildings; then follow "The College Course" (which deals mainly with the relations between Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and Harvard, and between Princeton and Edinburgh); "Modern Social Problems"; and the "Responsibilities of National Power and Influence." The two last are somewhat didactic in tone; but as a rule these essays deal with the minutiæ of a vast subject, and the mass of the United States which are not New England hardly come into consideration. The South, the West, and the Middle West have to be taken into account in any criticism of President Wilson's policy.

The late Hereford B. George's well-known *Gencalogical Tables* (Clarendon Press. 7*s*. 6*d*. n. 1916) has gone into a fifth edition, which has been revised and enlarged by Mr. J. R. H. Weaver, of Trinity College, Oxford. The dynasties added in this edition are those of Belgium, Norway, Greece, Serbia, Montenegro, Roumania, and Bulgaria, all of which add materially to the value of this standard work at the present time. Inasmuch as a list of Popes was always included in these "genealogical" tables, and a list of the Presidents of the United States of America was inserted in the fourth edition, we cannot see why the Holy Roman Emperors should not have a list as well. Most of them come, of course, under their different families among the German sovereigns, but that seems an inadequate reason for not collecting them together and carrying back the list to Constantine at least.

NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS.

[*Under this head it is proposed to give a list of most of the books dealing with history which have appeared during the preceding quarter, with an indication of the contents when they are not clearly expressed in the title. The references are, unless otherwise stated, to notices in* The Times Literary Supplement, *the pages of which are numbered continuously and can therefore be identified without specification of date.*]

REST DAYS : a Study in Early Law and Morality. By Hutton Webster. The Macmillan Co. 12*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 353.)

THE GREEK HOUSE : from the Neolithic period to the Hellenistic Age. By Bertha C. Rider. 372 pp. Cambridge University Press. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 424.)

ANCIENT GREEK INSCRIPTIONS in the British Museum : Part IV., Section II. By F. H. Marshall. Pp. 107–301. 30*s. n.* (p. 305.)

THE ROMAN CIVILIZATION. By A. F. Giles. 92 pp. Jack. 6*d. n.*

THE RACES of Ireland and Scotland. By W. C. Mackenzie. xiv+396 pp. Paisley : A. Gardner. 7*s.* 6*d. n.*

THE ANCIENT CROSS SHAFTS at Bewcastle and Ruthwell. By the Rt. Rev. G. F. Browne. 11¾×8¾, 92 pp. Cambridge University Press. 7*s.* 6*d. n.*

THE ORIGINS OF THE ISLAMIC STATE : the Kitâb-Futûh Al-Buldân of Al-Balâdhuri. Trans. with notes by P. K. Hitti. (Columbia University Studies, Vol. LXVIII.) xi+518 pp. P. S. King. 16*s.*

GENEALOGICAL TABLES illustrative of Modern History. By H. B. George. 5th edition, revised and enlarged by J. R. H. Weaver. 55 pp. Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d. n.*

CATHOLICISM IN MEDIEVAL WALES. By J. E. de Hirsch-Davies. xi+157 pp. R. and T. Washbourne. 3*s.* 6*d. n.*

SERBIAN MACEDONIA : an Historical Survey. By P. Popovic. Preface by A. H. E. Taylor. 32 pp. The *Near East.* 3*d.*

CAL. CLOSE ROLLS, Hen. III., 1242–47. vi+685 pp. H.M. Stationery Office. 17*s.* 6*d.*

REGISTRUM Joh. de Pontissara Episcopi Wyntoniensis, 1282–1304. Ed. C. Deedes. cxv+pp. 321–371. Canterbury and York Soc.

THE ENGLISH CIVIL SERVICE in the fourteenth century. By T. F. Tout. 32 pp. Manchester University Press. 1*s. n.* (p. 436.)

CAL. CHARTER ROLLS, Vol. V., 1341–1417. xvi+705 pp. H.M. Stationery Office. 15*s.*

CAL. PATENT ROLLS, Edw. III. Vol. XVI., 1374–7. 762 pp. H.M. Stationery Office. 15*s.*

THE BLACK DEATH. By A. Elizabeth Levett and A. Ballard. RURAL NORTHAMPTONSHIRE UNDER THE COMMONWEALTH. By R. Lennard. (Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History, Ed. P. Vinogradoff, Vol. v) xi+120+135 pp. Clarendon Press. 12*s.* 6*d. n.*

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSPORTATION in Modern England. By W. T. Jackman. 2 vols. xv+vii+820 pp. Cambridge University Press. 24*s. n.* (p. 389.) Deals mainly with period c. 1400–1850.

VICENTE ANES PINCON. By J. R. McClymont. 82 pp. B. Quaritch. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 401.)

STUDIES IN TUDOR HISTORY. By W. P. M. Kennedy. 340 pp. Constable. 5*s. n.*

ENGLAND'S FIRST GREAT WAR MINISTER (Wolsey). By Ernest Law. xxvi+273 pp., illus. Bell. 6*s. n.*

THE EDWARDIAN INVENTORIES for the City and County of Exeter. Transcribed by B. Cresswell. (Alcuin Club Collections, No. XX.) xvi+90 pp. Mowbray. 10*s. n.*

NOTES ON THE BISHOPRIC OF WORCESTER, 1547–1559. By J. Davenport. 36 pp. Worcester : E. G. Humphreys. 1*s. n.*

THE MASTERING OF MEXICO. By Kate Stephens. xvii+335 pp. The Macmillan Co. 6*s.* 6*d. n.*

An account of the Spanish Conquest.

THE SUCCESSORS OF DRAKE. By Julian S. Corbett (New Impression : first published 1900). Longmans. 10*s.* 6*d. n.*

SHAKESPEARE'S ENGLAND. 2 vols. Clarendon Press. 25*s. n.* (pp. 337, 417.)

THE CONQUEST OF VIRGINIA: the Forest Primeval. By C. W. Sams. xxiii+432 pp. Putnam. 18*s. n.* (p. 352.)

CAL. STATE PAPERS relating to English Affairs, in the archives of Venice and other Libraries of N. Italy. Vol. XXI., 1628–9. Ed. A. B. Hinds. lv+737 pp. H.M. Stationery Office. 15*s. n.* (pp. 424, 441.)

DE GESANDTSCHAFT der Protestantischen Schweiz bei Cromwell und den General-Staaten der Niederlande, 1652–4. Von Th. Ischer. Berne: Gustav Grunau. (p. 398.)

THE NAVY OF THE RESTORATION. By A. W. Tedder. x+234 pp. Cambridge University Press. 7*s.* 6*d. n.* (pp. 409, 437.)

CAL. TREASURY BOOKS, 1681–1685. Vol. VII., Parts I.–III. Prepared by W. A. Shaw. Pp. xc+1974. H.M. Stationery Office. 20*s.*+22*s.*+15*s.*

KEIGWIN'S REBELLION. By R. and O. Strachey. Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 387.)

CAL. STATE PAPERS, COLONIAL Series. America and W. Indies, 1704–5. Edited by Cecil Headlam. xi+807 pp. H.M. Stationery Office. 15*s.*

REPORT ON THE MSS. OF LORD POLWARTH. (Hist. MSS. Com.) Vol. II. (1718–20). xviii+693 pp. H.M. Stationery Office. 2*s.* 10*d.*

IRELAND AND FRANCE. Trans. from the French of Alfred Duquet. Intro., etc., by J. de L. Smyth. xxxi+169 pp. Maunsel. 3*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 376.)

REVIEW OF HIST. PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO CANADA. Ed. G. M. Wrong, H. H. Langton, and W. S. Wallace. Vol. XX. (1915). Toronto University Press. $1.50.

CAL. STUART PAPERS at Windsor. (Hist. MSS. Com.) Vol. VI. xc+842 pp. H.M. Stationery Office. 3*s.* 9*d.*

THE NATIONAL HISTORY of France: The 18th Century. By C. Stryienski. Trans. H. N. Dickinson. 345 pp. Heinemann. 7*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 329.)

ENGLAND AND GERMANY, 1740–1914. By B. E. Schmitt. ix+524 pp. Princeton University Press. 8*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 350.)

CATALOGUE OF MSS. in European Languages in the Library of the India Office. Vol. I., The Mackenzie Collections. By C. O. Blagden. 302+xxxii pp. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* Vol. II., Pt. I., The Orme Collection. By S. C. Hill. 421+xxxv pp. Clarendon Press. (p. 363.)

AN AID TO THE STUDY OF INDIAN HISTORY. By A. Gaffar, B.A. 156+16 pp. Calcutta: Sen, Ray, and Co. 10*a.*

TRAVELS IN THE AMERICAN COLONIES. Ed. N. D. Mereness. The Macmillan Co. 12*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 341.)

18th century journals.

THE REVOLUTION IN VIRGINIA. By H. J. Eckenrode. x+311 pp. Constable. 8*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 352.)

DAVID THOMPSON'S NARRATIVE of his Explorations, 1784–1812. Ed. J. B. Tyrrell. xcviii+582 pp. Toronto: The Champlain Soc. (p. 377.)

LA CONVENTION. By Jules Michelet. (Cheap reprint.) 477 pp. Nelson. 1.25 f.

THE WAR DIARY of a London Scot, 1796–7. Ed. W. C. Mackenzie. 216 pp. Paisley: A. Gardner. 3*s.* 6*d. n.* (pp. 316, 333, 346, 369.)

THE HISTORY OF NAPOLEON Buonaparte. By J. G. Lockhart. Intro. J. Holland Rose. xx+539 pp. Milford. 2*s. n.*

NAPOLEON: the Last Phase. By Lord Rosebery. (Cheap reprint.) 384 pp. Nelson. 1*s.* 3*d. n.*

READINGS IN THE ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES (1600–1865). By E. L. Bogart and C. M. Thompson. xxvii+862 pp. Longmans. 12*s.* 6*d. n.*

LORD SELKIRK'S WORK IN CANADA. By Chester Martin. (Oxford Historical and Literary Studies. Vol. 7.) 240 pp. Clarendon Press. 8*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 413.)

A GRAPHIC HISTORY of Modern Europe (1789–1914). By C. Morris and L. H. Dawson. 359 pp., illustrated. Harrap. 5*s. n.*

THE INDEPENDENCE OF BELGIUM (1815 to the Great War). By H. N. Williams. 32 pp. Hutchinson. 7*d. n.*

WRITINGS OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS. Ed. W. C. Ford. Vol. VI., 1816–19. 753 pp. The Macmillan Co. 15*s. n.* (p. 331.)

LAMARTINE Orateur. Par L. Barthou. Hachette. 7.50 *f.* (p. 364.)

REMINISCENCES OF THE INDIAN MUTINY and Afghanistan. By Col. Sir E. Thackeray. vii+181 pp. Smith, Elder. 5*s. n.*

HISTORY OF THE AUSTRALIAN BUSH-RANGERS. By G. E. Boxall. 4th edition, revised. xvi+393 pp. Milford. 3*s.* 6*d. n.*

FILIBUSTERS AND FINANCIERS: William Walker (1824–60) and his associates. By W. O. Scroggs. ix+408 pp. The Macmillan Co. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 317.)

PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS of Abraham Lincoln. By H. B. Rankin. xvi+412 pp. Putnam. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 320.)

ABRAHAM LINCOLN. By Lord Charnwood. viii+479 pp. Constable. 6*s. n.* (p. 388.)

THE STORY OF THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY. By K. Morris. 154 pp. W. Stevens. 3*s.* 6*d. n.*

LE GÉNÉRAL SKOBELEFF. Par Mme. Juliette Adam. Berger-Levrault. 1.25*f.*

Charles Stewart Parnell. By J. H. Parnell. xi+312 pp. Constable. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (pp. 282, 297.)

Towards Social Democracy? By Sidney Webb. 48 pp. Fabian Soc. 1*s. n*

Reprinted from the Cambridge Modern History, Vol. XII., with a preface and notes.

A Political History of Japan during the Meiji Era, 1867–1912. By W. W. McLaren. 380 pp. Allen and Unwin. 12*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 399.)

CURRENT HISTORY AND POLITICS.

The Statesman's Year Book, 1916. Ed. J. Scott Keltie and M. Epstein. xliv+1560 pp. Macmillan. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 344.)

Natural Rights: a criticism of some Political and Ethical conceptions. By D. G. Ritchie. xii+304 pp. Allen and Unwin. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* First appeared in 1894.

Epidemics resulting from Wars. By F. Prinzing. xii+346 pp. Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 356.)

From the Crusades to the 19th Century; especially the Thirty Years' War, the Napoleonic Wars, and the Franco-German War.

The International Crisis: lectures on the Theory of the State. Introductory address by Viscount Bryce. 163 pp. Milford. 4*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 350.)

Nelson's History of the War. Vol. XIII. By John Buchan. 288 pp. 1*s.* 3*d. n.*

A General Sketch of the European War: the Second Phase. By H. Belloc. 404 pp. Nelson. 6*s. n.* (p. 339.)

The Great World War: a History. Ed. F. A. Mumby. Part XII. Pp. 225–336+vii. Gresham Publishing Co. 2*s.* 6*d. n.*

The Road to Liege: the Path of Crime, August, 1914. By G. Somville. With a Preface by H. C. De Wiart, Minister of Justice. Trans. B. Miall. xxii+296 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 362.)

Reponse au Livre-Blanc Allemand du Mai 10, 1915: "Die Völkerrechtswidrige Führung des belgischen Volkskriegs." Royaume de Belgique. Ministère de la Justice, et Ministère des Affaires Etrangères. Guerre de 1914–1916. Paris: Berger-Levrault.

The Battle of Jutland Bank: despatches of Sir J. Jellicoe and Sir D. Beatty. Ed. C. Sanford Terry. 95 pp. Milford. 6*d.* (p. 409.)

The Story of Lord Kitchener. By H. F. B. Wheeler. 288 pp. Harrap. 3*s.* 6*d. n.*

Le Général Gallieni. Par Judith Cladel. Berger-Levrault. 2 *f.* (p. 324.)

The Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 (Text, etc.). Ed. J. B. Scott. xxxiii+303 pp. Milford. (p. 398.)

International Government. By L. S. Woolf. 259 pp. (Fabian Soc.) Allen and Unwin. 6*s. n.* (p. 398.)

The Supreme Will: the Danger of a Premature Peace. By H. Dunlop. 191 pp. The Hague: M. Nijhoff.

Truth and the War. By E. D. Morel. xxvi+324 pp. National Labour Press. 2*s.*

The Deeper Causes of the War. By E. Hovelaque. Allen and Unwin. 2*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 377.)

The Causes and Consequences of the War. By Yves Guyot. Trans. F. A. Holt. xxxvi+360 pp. Hutchinson. 10*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 327.)

Humanity versus Un-Humanity: a Criticism of the German Idea in its Political and Philosophical Development. By A. S. Elwell-Sutton. 222 pp. Fisher Unwin. 4*s.* 6*d. n.*

Germany vs. Civilization. By W. R. Thayer. vii+238 pp. Constable. 4*s.* 6*d. n*

Deutsche Politik. By Fürst von Bülow. Berlin: Reimar Hobbing. (p. 339.)

Extracted, with omissions and revisions, from "Deutschland unter Kaiser Wilhelm II." (1913).

Le Plan Pangermaniste démasqué. Par A. Chéradame. Plon-Nourrit. 4 *f.* (p. 315.)

The German Empire between Two Wars, 1871–1914. By R. H. Fife, jun. xiv+400 pp. The Macmillan Co. 6*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 398.)

Central Europe. By F. Naumann. Intro. W. J. Ashley. Trans. C. M. Meredith. xix+354 pp. P. S. King. 7*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 375.)

The Foundations of Germany. By J. Ellis Barker. ix+280 pp. Smith, Elder. 7*s.* 6*d.* (pp. 410, 441.)

La Guerre Economique dans nos Colonies. Par P. Perreau-Pradier et M. Besson. F. Alcan. 3.50 *f.* (p. 382.)

The New Protectionism. By J. A. Hobson. Fisher Unwin. 2*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 386.)

Detruisez l'Autriche-Hongrie! Par E. Benes. Delagrave. 1 *f.* (p. 382: "The value of this book is out of all proportion to its size. It furnishes a brilliant historical review of the martyrdom of the Czechs in history.")

RUSSIA IN ARMS. By Lt.-Col. Roustam Bek. xi+197 pp. Nisbet. 2*s.* 6*d. n.*

LA QUESTION DU BOSPHORE et des Dardanelles. By N. Dascovici. Genève: Georg et Cie. (p. 326.)

L'ITALIE EN GUERRE. Par H. Charriaut et M.-L. AMICI-GROSSI. Flammarion. 3.50 *f.* (p. 382.)

L'ANGLETERRE ET LA GUERRE. Par A. Chevrillon. Hachette. 3.50 *f.* (p. 315.)

THE COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS (the British Empire). Part I. Ed. L. Curtis. Pp. xix+722. Macmillan. 6*s. n.* (p. 351.)

IMPERO E LIBERTA NELLE COLONIE INGLESI. By C. Paladini. Preface by Sir H. Johnston. xxviii+509 pp. Florence: R. Bemporad. (p. 386.)

POLITICAL PARTIES: the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy. By R. Michels. Trans. from the 2nd Italian edition by E. and C. Paul. Jarrold. 12*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 290.)

REPORT, with Appendices, of the Archbishop's Committee on Church and State. iv+304 pp. S.P.C.K. 2*s.* 6*d. n.*

THE SINN FEIN REBELLION as I Saw It. By Mrs. Hamilton Norway. 111 pp. Smith, Elder. 2*s.* n. (p. 375.)

A CITIZENS' ARMY: the Swiss System. By Julian Grande. xxxi+147 pp. Chatto and Windus. 3*s.* 6*d. n.*

THE SINGLE TAX Movement in the United States. By A. N. Young. x+340 pp. Princeton University Press. 6*s.* 6*d. n.*

MODERNISING THE MONROE DOCTRINE. By C. H. Sherrill. Intro. by N. M. Butler. xiv+203 pp. Constable. 6*s. n.* (p. 361.)

THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE: a Study in American Foreign Policy. By R. G. Usher. xxi+350 pp. Constable. 7*s.* 6*d. n.* (p. 422.)

THE CHINA YEAR BOOK, 1916. By H. P. Montague Bell and H. G. W. Woodhead. xix+729 pp. Routledge. 10*s. n.*

LOCAL HISTORY.

REPORT ON THE RECORDS OF THE CITY OF EXETER. (Hist. MSS. Com.) xvi+536 pp. H.M. Stationery Office. 2*s.* 3*d.*

PROC. OF THE HAMPSHIRE FIELD CLUB AND ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY. Vol. VII., Part III. Ed. J. H. Cope. xlv+107 pp. Southampton: H. M. Gilbert and Son. 5*s.*

Includes papers on Boldre Church, the catalogue of the library of Titchfield Abbey, and Church Goods in Hampshire A.D. 1552.

CHAPTER ACTS of Lincoln Cathedral, 1520–36. Ed. by R. E. G. Cole. xxii+238 pp. Lincoln Record Soc.

LINCOLNSHIRE. By J. C. Cox. xv+364 pp. Methuen. 3*s.* 6*d. n.*

STONEHENGE. By F. Stevens. 96 pp. Sampson Low. 1*s. n.*

A HISTORY OF ST. MARY'S CHURCH, WALTHAMSTOW. By G. F. Bosworth. 16 pp. Walthamstow Antiquarian Soc. 4*s.*

SCHOOL-BOOKS.

THE PROGRESS TO HISTORY. Ed. R. Wilson. I., Pictures of Long, Long Ago. 128 pp. 1*s.* II., Peeps into old books. 176 pp. 1*s.* 2*d.* III., Decisive days in British History. 224 pp. 1*s.* 4*d.* IV., Story of the United Kingdom. 256 pp. 1*s.* 6*d.* V., Children of the Seven Seas. 288 pp. 1*s.* 9*d.* VI., Britain and European Liberty. 320 pp. 2*s.* Macmillan.

THE WORLD AND ITS DISCOVERY. By H. B. Wetherill. 4 parts: Africa, 119 pp.; Asia, 99 pp.; America, 131 pp.; Australia, 62 pp. Clarendon Press. 1*s.* each part. (*Nature*, 24 Aug., p. 520.)

A SHORT HISTORY OF IRELAND. By Constantia Maxwell. 133 pp. Fisher Unwin. 1*s.* 6*d. n.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 86.)

ELEMENTARY COURSE OF SOUTH AFRICAN HISTORY: Part II., 1820–1910. By Marie Harthill and Edith D. Slater. Pp. xx+313. Cape Town: Maskew Miller. 2*s.* 6*d. n.*

HANDWORK AND SOCIAL HISTORY. By E. Stevinson. 112 pp. Clarendon Press. 2*s.* 6*d. n.* (*Educ. Supplt.*, p. 98.)

E. J. D.